DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 218 924 FL 012 900

AUTHOR	Clark, John L. D.
TITLE	A Survey of the Status of Language Training in the Peace Corps. Final Project Report.
INSTITUTION	Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J.
SPONS AGENCY	Peace Corps, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Oct 81
CONTRACT	PC-81-043-1020
NOTE	211p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC09 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Educational Research; Field Tests; Instructional Materials; Postsecondary Education; *Program Effectiveness; *Second Language Instruction; Surveys; *Teacher Education; *Teaching Methods; Testing
IDENTIFIERS	*Peace Corps

ABSTRACT

This report describes the planning, operation, and outcomes of a questionnaire-and-site-visit survey of language teaching facilities and activities at Peace Corps in-country training centers on a worldwide basis, conducted from March to September 1981. The report is divided into three sections: an overview, an analysis of aspects of current language training in the Peace Corps, and recommendations. The overview describes the development and distribution of the survey questionnaire; planning and conduct of in-field site visits; characteristics of responding programs; funding, facilities and supplies; trainees; duration and scheduling of language classes; instructor selection and evaluation; teaching materials; goals; instructional approaches and activities; in-service language training; placement and assessment; use of the Foreign Service Institute interview; special learners; contacts with Peace Corps/Washington; and recommendations. In the second section, a number of aspects of current language training in the Peace Corps are analyzed in terms of recent theoretical and research-based developments, with relevant implications being drawn for possible improvements in Peace Corps practices. The recommendations section further develops suggestions made in the course of the report. References and relevant documents conclude the volume. (Author/AMH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED218924

A Survey of the Status
# of Language Training
in the Peace Corps

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

The Peace Corps

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Final Project Report

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

October 1981

Educational Testing Service
Princeton, New Jersey

FL012900

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables.....iii

Introduction.....iv

I. OVERVIEW.....1

Development and Distribution of Survey Questionnaire.....1
    Questionnaire Distribution and Return.....4
Planning and Conduct of In-field Site Visits.....7
    Selection of Sites to be Visited.....7
    Development of On-Site Data Gathering Procedures.....8
    Planning Meeting with Project Consultants.....9
    Development of Classroom Observation Form.....10
    Site-Visit Itineraries.....14
    On-site Data Obtained.....16
General Characteristics of Responding Programs.....18
Language Training Program Funding, Facilities, and Supplies.....20
    Classroom Facilities.....21
    Audiovisual Equipment.....22
General Characteristics of Student Trainees.....23
Duration and Scheduling of Language Classes.....24
Instructor Selection, Training, and Evaluation.....27
    Availability of Instructors.....29
    Instructor Backgrounds and Qualifications.....29
    Training of New Instructors.....30
    Evaluation of Instructors.....32
Teaching Materials.....33
Language Program Goals.....34
    Written Performance Goals.....34
    Satisfaction with Established Goals.....35
    FSI Scores as Performance Goals.....36
Instructional Approaches and Activities.....38
    On-site Visit Data.....39
    General Instructional Practices.....40
    Reported Methodologies.....42
    Specific Classroom Activities.....44
    On-site Data on Classroom Activities.....52
    Specific Classroom Activities Observed.....55
In-service Language Training.....57
Language-Class Placement and Course-of-Training Assessment.....59
Use of FSI Interview.....62
Instructional Procedures for "Special" Learners.....67
Contacts with and Assistance from Peace Corps/Washington.....69
General Opinions and Recommendations.....71

II. COMPARISON AND ANALYSIS.....73

Methodology; Teacher Training, and Materials Implications.....73
    Grammar-Translation Method.....76
    Audiolingual Method.....77
    Suggestopedia.....79
    Total Physical Response.....81
    Counseling-Learning/Community Language Learning.....82
    Direct Method.....84
    Silent Way.....85
    Cognitive-Code.....86
    Adherence to Peace Corps Language Goals.....87
    Teaching Techniques.....88
    Classroom and Equipment Requirements.....88
    Teacher Background and Training Implications.....88
    Textbook and Materials Implications.....89
    Types of Students.....89
    Summary.....90
    Implications of Recent Work in Curriculum Development.....90
    A Combined Approach.....91
    Relevant Research Studies.....92
Proficiency Testing.....95
    Reliability of FSI Interviewing In-Field.....97
    Validity Issues.....99
    Basic Considerations in Test Planning.....100
    Test Development Considerations.....103
    Development of Scoring Procedures.....106
    Implementation Procedures.....108
Achievement Testing.....110
Methodology Match to Language.....113
Methodology for "Special" Learners.....114
    Canadian Public Service Experience.....116
    Recommended Procedure.....118
Communications Relevance.....119
    Self- and Second-Party Ratings.....120
    Relevant Instructional Practices.....121
    Explicit Instruction in Communicative Techniques.....122
    Training in Reception of Communicative Cues.....123
Structural Considerations.....123
    Program Support.....125
    Information Dissemination from PC/W to Field.....126
    Communications from the Field to PC/W.....128
    End of Training Reports.....128
    Site Facilities Reports.....131
    Volunteer-Provided Information.....132

III. RECOMMENDATIONS.....135

References.....141

Appendices.....146

    A. Survey Questionnaire
    B. Site-Visit Protocols
    C. Classroom Observation Form

List of Tables

1. Characteristics of Trainees in Most Recently Completed Language Program....24

2. Reported Scheduling of Language Classes....25

3. Total Reported Contact Hours of Instruction....26

4. Judged Optimum Language Training Schedule....28

5. Hours of Preliminary Training for Language Instructors....31

6. Frequency of Use of Instructional Activities as Reported by Training Sites....46

Introduction

The following pages describe the planning, operation, and outcomes of a questionnaire-and site-visit survey of language teaching facilities and activities at Peace Corps in-country training centers on a worldwide basis, conducted during March-September 1981. The three basic purposes of the study were to: (1) carry out a thorough investigation of the language learning goals, instructional methods, support facilities, and other characteristics of the language teaching program at each in-country site, and provide a comprehensive overview of the current status of language training at these sites; (2) draw comparisons between current Peace Corps training practices and developments in language teaching methodology and related areas within the past several years that would suggest possible areas of improvement in Peace Corps language training, with special attention being paid to the extent to which this training might be more directly focused on the development of culturally and situationally appropriate communicative proficiency in the host country language (as distinguished from the development of linguistic accuracy *per se*); and (3) on the basis of the two preceding activities, make recommendations concerning specific improvements in the language training process that would be expected to increase its effectiveness in developing communicatively-oriented language competence on the part of the trainees. Two related areas that were also to be addressed in the course of the study included a consideration of whether certain language teaching methodologies were better suited than others to the teaching of particular languages or groups of languages; and an investigation of optimum teaching procedures for "older" language learners and learners with non-academic backgrounds, such as skilled tradespeople. In addition, attention was to be paid to examining and making recommendations concerning structural issues involved in the currently decentralized (i.e., in-country) system of Peace Corps language training, including such matters as in-country program support by Peace Corps/Washington, and the nature and extent of language-relevant information exchange (in both directions) between PC/W and the field.

The author of the report is indebted to a number of persons who made substantial contributions to the work of the project. These include Dr. Catherine Nelson (Educational Testing Service) who provided close collaboration on the development of the survey questionnaire; Messrs. Dennis O'Toole, Protase E.

Woodford (both at ETS) and Dr. Jean Leblon of Vanderbilt University, who carried out the on-site data gathering activities at training sites within the NANEAP, LAC and Africa regions, respectively; and Ms. Barbara Burns of the United Nations staff and Dr. Diane Larsen-Freeman (Experiment in International Living), who served as outside consultants to the project during its entire term of operation. The participation and assistance of each of these individuals is gratefully acknowledged; however, the author assumes full responsibility for any errors of fact or interpretation that may be present in this report.

John L. D. Clark

I. OVERVIEW

The first portion of this section describes the planning, development, and distribution of a detailed survey questionnaire to Peace Corps language training programs in all three Peace Corps regions and the planning and carrying out of supplementary on-site visits to selected training programs in each region.

The results of the questionnaire survey are then presented, together with relevant additional information obtained during the site visits, to provide a detailed overview of Peace Corps language training facilities and activities at the present time.

DEVELOPMENT AND DISTRIBUTION OF SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

The survey questionnaire was considered to be the single most important source of information that would be available to the project concerning the physical and organizational characteristics of the language training program at each site, the nature of the instruction, and opinions and recommendations of in-country staff about the training program and desirable improvements to it. For this reason, and because of the extremely short time period allotted in the overall project schedule for preparation and distribution of the questionnaire (approximately three weeks after project initiation on March 27, 1981), highly intensive work and coordination was required over this period between the project staff at ETS, the two outside consultants to the project (Dr. Diane Larsen-Freeman and Ms. Barbara Burns), and appropriate Peace Corps/Washington program and training staff.

Through a series of face-to-face meetings and follow-up telephone conversations over a two-week period, as well as close examination of questionnaires and data gathering protocols available from other Peace Corps-related studies (Carroll, 1966; Arthur D. Little Co., 1970), a detailed outline of content areas to be included in the questionnaire was developed, as follows:

(1) basic characteristics of the language training program (location, primary/secondary languages taught, annual number of training programs conducted);

(2) language course scheduling and contact hours (number of days per week language classes held, number of hours per day, total number of contact hours of language training);

(3) language training goals, including presence or absence of written statements of language/communication/cultural goals for pre-service and in-service language training; role of the FSI interview in establishing training goals (e.g., required minimum level on FSI scale to begin in-country service); follow-up activities in the event that language training goals are not satisfactorily met);

(4) selection, initial training, and ongoing monitoring and training of language instructors on-site; background, prior teaching experience, and general availability of instructors;

(5) trainee characteristics as potentially related to language-learning success (age, academic vs. non-academic background);

(6) basic characteristics of the language training program, including overall methodology or methodologies used; degree of integration with other pre-service training activities; (e.g., technical training for work assignment, health and sanitation instruction); extent to which language training is specifically adapted to eventual job assignments of trainees, provision of special classes or other instructional alternatives for older learners and/or learners with little academic background;

(7) availability, state of repair, etc. of language program support equipment and supplies (e.g., xerox, mimeograph equipment, tape recorders, slide and film projectors);

(8) adequacy of physical facilities for the language classes (size, location, freedom from noise of classroom areas);

(9) procedures used for placing trainees into language classes, course-of-training evaluation of trainee progress, end-of-training assessment;

(10) nature and scope of in-service language training;

(11) use of and opinions concerning the FSI interview procedure as an appropriate measure of communicative ability for Peace Corps purposes;

(12) nature and extent of communications to and from Peace Corps/ Washington concerning language training matters; support provided by PC/W;

(13) for any of the above, as appropriate, opinions and recommendations on the part of the respondents concerning the topics covered;

(14) a final set of open-ended questions providing respondents the opportunity to supply relevant information not fully covered in the other sections of the questionnaire and/or to make further comments concerning perceived needs of the language training program, suggestions for improvement, and so forth.

It was realized that in order to adequately cover all of the above topics a very extensive and detailed questionnaire would be required, and there was thus some concern as to whether respondents on-site would in fact be willing to spend the amount of time needed to supply the requested information. To simplify the respondents' task as much as possible (as well as to facilitate later analysis of the obtained data), it was decided that objectively phrased "check-off" response formats would be used wherever the possible answers were sufficiently limited and predetermined. Wherever the responses were for the most part predictable but contained some latitude for other types of answers, a combination format would be used, in which the respondent would be asked to check off one of several items if appropriate or, if none of the presented options was satisfactory, to provide a brief written response. Questionnaire items involving written-out answers would be limited to areas for which check-off or short-answer formats were considered inadequate (for the most part, "general opinion" or "additional information" items).

Within the second and third weeks of project operation, the survey questionnaire was drafted by project staff along the content and format lines described above and submitted to PC/W for review. Following the incorporation of certain relatively minor changes as suggested by PC/W, the survey questionnaire was printed at ETS in the form of an 8 1/2 x 11-inch center-stapled booklet, this format being selected for ease in handling and durability in transit. Including the spaces provided for write-in comments, total working length of the questionnaire was 37 pages. A facsimile copy of the complete questionnaire is reproduced in Appendix A.

In planning for questionnaire distribution, an initial question had been that of identifying the most appropriate respondent. For training sites having a formally designated language coordinator, it was felt that this person would probably be in the best position to respond knowledgeably and accurately to the questions posed, although certain items (for example, the age distribution and educational background of the total trainee group) might need to be obtained from another source. For sites without an official language coordinator, it was anticipated that the country director or associate director, consulting with members of the language teaching staff, would assume this responsibility. To take this probable variation into account, it was decided that the questionnaire would be initally addressed to the country director, who would be asked to consult with the language coordinator (if applicable) or other staff on-site, as necessary to obtain the indicated information. The printed directions in this regard (which appeared on the front cover of the survey booklet) were: "You should either complete the questions yourself or ask the language coordinator or other members of your staff who would be able to provide the requested data. It is quite possible that two or more people will be needed to complete this questionnaire."

Questionnaire Distribution and Return

On the recommendation of the project officer, a sufficient number of questionnaire copies were printed to permit sending both an initial mailing from ETS to the individual Peace Corps countries (using regular U.S. airmail) and a back-up shipment of an additional questionnaire copy via pouch from PC/W.

The ETS-distributed questionnaires were mailed on April 23, 1981 to the attention of the Country Director in all countries known to be operating a current language training program, as follows:

NANEAP

Fiji
Korea
Malaysia
Micronesia
Morocco
Nepal
Oman
Philippines
Thailand
Tonga
Tunisia
Solomon Islands
Western Samoa
Yemen

LAC

Belize
Chile
Costa Rica
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
Guatemala
Honduras
Paraguay

AFRICA

Benin
Botswana
Cameroon
Central African Republic
Gabon
Gambia
Ghana
Kenya
Lesotho
Liberia
Malawi
Mali
Mauritania
Niger
Senegal
Seychelles
Sierra Leone
Swaziland
Togo
Upper Volta
Zaire

In addition to the 43 countries listed above, questionnaires were also mailed inadvertently (through a general Peace Corps mailing list) to several countries which had either terminated their language training program or were for some other reason not offering language training on a current basis. Non-completed questionnaires or other communications were received from New Guinea (which reported "no experience to date" in language training); Barbados (first training program only partially completed and the survey thus of only "limited application"); Jamaica (no language program); Rwanda (all language training done in Zaire); and Tanzania (first language program not scheduled to start until August 1981). (These countries are not included in the response-rate tabulations below.)

Each mailing package sent from ETS was in the form of a single first class (airmail) shipping envelope, which included a copy of the questionnaire, a cover memorandum from Peace Corps/Washington (reproduced in Appendix A), and a pre-addressed return envelope.

The general directions printed on the front cover of the questionnaire requested, if it was at all possible, a maximum turnaround time of "three working days" following receipt of the questionnaire in-country. This request was modified to "five working days" in the cover memo, in acknowledgment of the many other time pressures and priorities of the in-country staff. However, both the questionnaire directions and memo emphasized the very tight project schedule and the need to have the completed questionnaire returned at the earliest possible opportunity. The back-up copies of the questionnaire, also with a copy of the cover memo and pre-addressed return envelope, were mailed to the same countries as the original mailing approximately one week after the first mailing.

Return of the completed questionnaires to ETS was appreciably slower and more sporadic than had been initially (and apparently over-optimistically) hoped. A single questionnaire was returned approximately 10 days after the initial mailing, followed by a two-week period in which no further questionnaires were received. Subsequently, additional questionnaires were received on a slow but fairly steady basis up until a processing cutoff date of June 10th, at which time an interim report of questionnaire results was prepared and sent to Peace Corps/Washington to meet a June 19th delivery date. Since the response rates at that time were quite low for two of the three Peace Corps regions -- 64% for NANEAP and 55% for LAC (82% for Africa) -- arrangements were made to cable the non-responding countries through PC/W and again request their cooperation. Most probably as a result of the follow-up cable, questionnaire returns resumed from late June through early August, with the net result that by the necessarily final date for questionnaire processing (August 20th), completed questionnaires had been returned by all but two of the

43 countries having ongoing language programs: Kenya and Korea. (A completed questionnaire was received for Korea on August 24th, but it was unfortunately not possible to incorporate these responses in the final analyses then under way.)

Final response rates for all three regions, based on a total possible return of 43 sites, were the highly satisfactory figures of 93%, 100%, and 95%, for NANEAP, LAC, and Africa, respectively. With the exception of only two Peace Corps countries, questionnaire data obtained in this study may be considered to reflect the total scope of current Peace Corps language training on a worldwide basis.

PLANNING AND CONDUCT OF IN-FIELD SITE VISITS

A series of on-site visits to selected language training sites in each of the Peace Corps regions was intended to add to and complement the information obtained through the survey questionnaire in three general ways. First, direct "eyes-on" observation of the language training program and face-to-face discussion with language-training and other personnel on-site would help to evaluate the general level of reliability and accuracy of the questionnaire-based information as supplied by the respondents. Second, it was anticipated that through sensitively conducted interviews with the country director, language coordinator, and others on-site (including a certain number of trainees and volunteers to obtain their own perceptions), it would be possible to obtain a substantial amount of additional information about the language training program which could not be well conveyed (or which the respondent would be hesitant to provide) in a questionnaire format.

Selection of Sites to be Visited

Selection of the particular training sites to be visited in each of the three regions was made by appropriate regional staff at the Peace Corps/Washington office, in consultation with ETS project staff and taking into account both the desirability of providing as wide a selection of sites as possible (in terms of size of program, languages taught, methodologies used, types of trainees represented, job assignments being trained for, and other factors) and the necessity to schedule these visits so as to fit within the relatively short and fairly specific time period during which these trips would have to take place in order to coincide properly with the scheduling of other required project activities. Within these constraints, a total of 12 training sites were selected for the on-site visits, as listed in alphabetical order by region below:

Africa

Cameroon
Ghana
Swaziland
Upper Volta
Zaire

LAC

Costa Rica
Ecuador
Honduras
Paraguay

NANEAP

Malaysia
Philippines
Solomon Islands

Although these selections were by no means as flexible as would have been possible in the absence of the necessary scheduling and travel constraints, they are considered to represent a reasonably diverse sampling of the totality of Peace Corps language programs.

Development of On-Site Data Gathering Procedures

As indicated in the project proposal, the on-site data gathering was to include two major activities: the holding of semi-structured interviews (as well as arranging for more informal contacts) with both administrative staff and language program staff at the training site; and the direct observation of representative language classes. In addition to carrying out these two activities, the on-site observers were to make note of the physical conditions for language learning at the site (including the adequacy of classrooms and other facilities, availability of needed supplies, etc.) and, insofar as possible, to obtain additional relevant information concerning the language training program through informal contacts and conversations with language teachers, trainees, and volunteers on-site.

To insure that the necessary activities would be carried out by the on-site observers in a thorough and consistent way, an extensive process of planning, materials preparation, and pre-trip briefing was carried out as described below.

Planning Meeting with Project Consultants

The first step in preparation for the on-site visits was the holding of a two-day meeting of project staff and the two outside consultants in Princeton, N.J. on May 17-18, 1981. Project staff at this meeting included Protase E. Woodford, designated for the LAC region trip; Dennis M. O'Toole, NANEAP; and the ETS project director. Dr. Jean Leblon, designated for the Africa region observations, was unable to attend the May 17-18 sessions due to a previously-scheduled travel responsibility out of the country. However, Dr. Leblon received a detailed separate briefing in Princeton by the project director over June 17-18; prior to this meeting, Dr. Leblon was sent copies of the classroom observation forms, interviewing protocols, and other materials for advance study and to insure that the briefing period would be most intensive and productive.

The May 17-18 meeting had two basic purposes: to discuss and come to agreement on the general approach to be followed in conducting interviews with the Peace Corps director, language coordinator, and other staff on-site and to develop an appropriate procedure and corresponding data-gathering form for the classroom observations. With respect to the interviews with the on-site staff, the following guidelines were developed:

(1) The first contact with the Peace Corps director (as well as with other on-site staff) would include a brief description of the project, emphasizing that its essential purpose was to obtain generalized information about language training on a Peace Corps-wide basis, rather than to "investigate" particular sites.

(2) In keeping with the preceding, assurances would be given early in the visit that any information obtained during the visit (as well as via the questionnaire itself) would be analyzed and reported on a generalized basis rather than with reference to any specific respondent or training site.

(3) It would not be appropriate (and in all probability counter-productive) to adopt a highly formalized approach to the face-to-face interviews. For this reason, fixed questions, quoted verbatim by the interviewer, were to be avoided, as were note-taking, checklist consulting, etc. in the course of the interview. Particular items of information not obtained during one conversation would be sought (in a natural and informal way) in the course of other contacts during the on-site period.

(4) Although written notes were not to be taken during the interviews/conversations themselves, the interviewer was to prepare a detailed written summary of any interview/conversation held, as soon as possible after it had taken place (and in any event in the course of the same day) to insure that the information would be retained accurately and in detail.

(5) Item-by-item "interview protocols" would be prepared and included in the kit of materials for each observer, giving the areas of information to be covered in interviews with the country director and language coordinator, as well as in conversations with trainees and in-service volunteers. These protocols (Appendix B) were to serve as memory aids for the observer to consult prior to the interviews (and as a framework for the written summaries) but were not to be visibly consulted during the interviews.

In addition to discussing in detail the approach to be taken in the on--site interviews, the meeting participants carried out a series of practice interviews on a role-play basis, with group critique and discussion.

Development of Classroom Observation Form

It was considered important to develop a data gathering procedure for the classroom observations that would provide a reasonably detailed and systematic record of classroom instructional activities (as well as of other relevant classroom conditions, such as seating arrangement and general ambience of the classroom, presence of noise or other distractions, etc.). At the same time, however, it was realized that use of a very highly detailed observational system, such as the procedures developed by Moskowitz (1971) or Fanselow (1975) would in all probability prove unwieldy if not impossible to utilize properly in the field, and in any event would represent a degree of detail that would be out of keeping with the need to provide a somewhat broader characterization of the kinds of instructional activities carried out at the site.

For these reasons, the project staff considered it preferable to develop a separate observation form which, it was felt, would provide the desired information in a form that could be satisfactorily worked with on-site. This form, prepared in a draft version for the May 17-18 meeting and reviewed and revised at this meeting, consisted of four pages of which the general contents and intended purpose are described below. The complete observation form is shown in Appendix C.

On the front page of the form, the first set of response spaces dealt with basic descriptive information: country, region, name of program, language being taught, date of observation, beginning and ending times for the class, location of the class within the total instructional sequence (i.e., number of hours into the total program at which the class was taking place), and the number of students present. A second set of response spaces was provided for brief descriptions of the seating arrangement used (row-by-row, semicircle or circle, etc.), posters or other realia present in the classroom (e.g., maps, vocabulary charts, Fidel charts, etc.), and the availability of a blackboard and any other presentation equipment (flip chart, overhead projector, tape recorder, etc.). Space was also provided to note any noise or other distractions that appeared to have an adverse impact on the overall effectiveness of the class.

To provide an indication of some of the basic characteristics of the classroom interaction and instructional focus, spaces were provided for the observer to record the approximate percentage of the total class time during which each of several conditions were present. The first of these involved determining the location of "class control," as being with the teacher, with the students, or shared between the teacher and students. The focus of control was considered to be with the teacher when he or she was clearly "in charge" of classroom activities and was determining in which way these activities were to proceed. (For example, drill practice led by the teacher or student work with dialogues would be considered under teacher control, even though the students were responding and interacting). "Student control" was considered to exist when the students themselves, either individually or collectively, were deciding what to do next in the class, with the teacher serving only as a resource person or facilitator. "Shared" control involved group discussion or other activity that appeared to be evenly balanced as to the responsibility for control.

A second basic characteristic, also recorded in percentage-of-time-during-class form, was the language used by the teacher (English or target language) and language used by students. A third item involved the proportion of time during which the class activities were of a "structured," "semi-structured," or "free conversation" nature. "Structured" activities were those in which the next step in the teaching process was highly predictable (e.g., pattern practice, study of dialogues, question/answer, etc.). At the other extreme, "free conversation" involved discussion of topics that did not bear on a predetermined lesson plan but that were brought up by the students (or by the teacher) on an obviously spontaneous basis. "Semi-structured" activities were those that appeared to involve some degree of pre-planning overall but at the same time allowed for a certain amount of expansion and digression in the course of the activity.

The fourth aspect to be evaluated on a percentage-of-class-time basis was the instructional "focus" of the class: linguistic, functional, topical, or situational. Classroom activities were considered to have a "linguistic" focus when they were directed toward the presentation or reinforcement of specific structural, lexical, or phonological aspects of the language as items to be learned in their own right. The class focus was considered "functional" when the activities were explicitly addressed to teaching the students how to carry out specified language-use functions such as requesting, complaining, sympathizing, agreeing, etc. A "topical" focus was present when the students were actively engaged in vocabulary study or other exercises reflecting a specific topical area, such as "transportation," "clothing," "foods," "shopping," and so forth. A "situational" focus involved the setting up of imaginary situattions in the classroom reflective of real-life language-use settings and asking the students to perform appropriately in these situations.

A fifth and final percentage-of-class-time item on the observation form dealt with the degree of active attention which the students were paying to the class activities (labeled as "student involvement"). This was defined as the estimated proportion of the class period during which the students appeared to be consciously engaged in the learning process, as opposed to day-dreaming or otherwise "tuning out" of the class activities. Spaces were also provided on the front page of the observation form to make brief written comments concerning both the pacing of the class (e.g., slow and belabored, at about the right pace for comprehension, too fast for adequate explanation or practice) and the sequencing of class activities (whether the class progressed in an orderly and logical manner or whether there were appreciable skips and digressions).

A response space labeled "CC" (for "cultural conflict") was provided for making notes of any instructionally detrimental situation occurring in the class that could be attributed to culturally-determined "misreadings" by the teacher of students' remarks or actions (or vice versa). Remaining areas on the first page of the observation form included spaces for a brief description of the major class activity, as well as for a paragraph-length "class summary and remarks."

The second and third pages of the observation form consisted simply of horizontally-lined colums labeled "time," "teacher," "student," "materials/equip.," and "remarks." These deliberately relatively unstructured areas were provided for the observer's use in making "point-of-occurrence" notes on the various major activities taking place during the class. In the "time" column was to be noted the particular time (either watch time or elapsed time) at which the observed activity began, and serving as a general indication of the amount of time devoted to the different activities. In the "teacher" column, a brief note was to be made concerning the teacher's role in the activity (e.g., "reads dialogue aloud"), and in the "student" column, a similar indication of the associated student behavior (e.g., "listen quietly"). Appropriate notations were to be made in the "materials/equip." column whenever the activity involved use of the text book, study of charts, distribution of handouts, etc. The "remarks" column was to be used for any additional information concerning a particular activity that the observer considered pertinent.

The fourth and final page of the observation form, which the observer was to fill out immediately following the class, consisted of a total of 56 descriptive statements of specific classroom activities drawn directly (and verbatim) from a corresponding "instructional approaches and activities" section of the survey questionnaire. Examples of these activity statements include "The instructor uses dramatic techniques and props to make meanings clear or introduce new language material"; "Instructor leads pattern-practice drills in class"; "Trainees take part in role-playing situations to practice previously-learned material." To facilitate the observer's judgments (and to provide for the increased level of objectivity that could be obtained by having the observer make a simple dichotomous decision about each activity), the three-point ("frequently," "occasionally," "rarely or never") response scale used in the survey questionnaire was replaced by a simple "observed"/"not observed" judgment. If a particular activity was actually seen taking place during the class period in question, this would be marked as "observed."

Site-Visit Itineraries

The site visits within each region were carried out according to the sequence and schedule shown below. Both here and elsewhere in the report, the countries involved are designated by an arbitrary code number, in keeping both with the generalized data gathering intent of the study and with the assurances given to the on-site staff that the identity of the site would not be linked with the descriptive information and discussions given in the final report.

Training Site	Dates of Visit (Inclusive)
LAC	
A	May 31-June 8, 1981
B	June 9-13
C	June 13-21
D	June 21-July 3
NANEAP	
E	June 2-9
F	June 9-18
G	June 21-29
AFRICA	
H	June 20-27
I	June 28-July 3
J	July 4-11
K	July 12-18
L	July 18-27

At eleven of the twelve sites visited, active language training was in operation. Across these sites, the point in the training sequence at which the observations took place varied from the first day of classes (site K) to the 11th week of a 12-week program (site H). At one site (E), which was initially arranged and scheduled for observation as an active program, language classes were found not to be in session during the observer's visit, the language staff being involved at that time in a six-day workshop in preparation for the next training cycle. Although observations of class sessions at this site were therefore not possible, the project observer did conduct interviews with the country director, coordinator, and other language staff as well as observe the site facilities and attend the planning workshop. Language program-related information obtained from these sources is included, as appropriate, with similar data from the other sites.

For each visited site, the total duration of the language training class in operation at the time of the visit, the point in the program (week in training) during which the observations took place, and the total number of trainees in that training contingent are shown below:

Training Site	Duration of Program	Week of Training	No. of Trainees
A	12 weeks	3rd	167
B	11 weeks	10th	11
C	13 weeks	2nd	25
D	11 weeks	2nd, 9th*	22,82*
F	9 weeks	8th	15
G	6 weeks	2nd	7
H	12 weeks	11th	20
I	12 weeks	3rd	16
J	11 weeks	2nd	22
K	12 weeks	1st	33
L	10 weeks	1st	43

*Two contingents in training, both on different cycles.

On-Site Data Obtained

In keeping with the approaches discussed and developed at the site-visit planning meeting, and based on the interviewing protocols shown in Appendix B, each of the three project observers conducted interviews and had less formal conversations and contacts with in-country program and language-training staff at each site visited, as well as with a number of trainees and volunteers. Reports of these meetings, with additional commentary by the observer as appropriate, were written up in fairly extensive detail for future reference both by the observers and by the project director in describing and analyzing the results of the visits. In addition, in the course of their visit to each site and using a new (blank) survey questionnaire form, the observers were asked to fill out--on the basis of of their own direct contacts or observations on-site --as many as possible of the relevant items on the questionnaire. Comparison of questionnaire responses completed "on-the-spot" to those originally provided by the questionnaire respondents was intended to provide an additional source of information in evaluating the general accuracy and candor of the original questionnaire responses.

On the basis of debriefings of several hours' duration with each of the three observers shortly after their return from the on-site visits, comparisons of observer-completed questionnaire items to those originally given by the Peace Corps staff, and the written notes of the observers' interviews/conversations with the Peace Corps staff, teachers, trainees, and volunteers on-site, the evidence points, in general, toward a high degree of accuracy and straightforwardness on the part of the original respondents in completing the various items of the questionnaire. Particular items for which there appeared to be discrepancies worthy of note are identified in the course of presentation and analysis of questionnaire results for the areas involved.

With respect to the classroom observations, over the period of their visits on-site, the three project observers sat in on and completed observation forms for a total of 132 language classes, including 43 Spanish classes, 36 French, and a combined total of 53 national/local languages, consisting of Twi (12 classes); Bahasa Malay (9), siSwati (8), Solomon Islands Pijin (8) Guaraní (5), Quechua (4), Lingala, Swahili, Tshiluba (2 each), and Ciluba (1). The number of individual observations at each training site is shown below:

Site	No. of Classes Observed
A	12
B	14
C	11
D	14
F	9
G	8
H	11
I	8
J	17
K	16
L	12

In-field experience in using the observation forms indicated that there was considerable variation across observers in the manner, style, and degree of detail in which the two inside pages of the form (chronological notes on classroom activities) were completed. In view of this variation, and also in realization of the great complexity of information represented in these notes, the project director and other staff concurred in the opinion that it would not be useful or informative to attempt to tabulate or otherwise analyze these notations in detail. However, for the two other basic data sources on the in-field observation forms (descriptive notes and percentage-of class time observations from the first page of the form; "observed"/"not observed" entries for the 56 listed classroom activities on the back of the form), straightforward tabulations and analyses were possible. Classroom observation data from these two sources are presented and discussed together with survey questionnaire results under appropriate section headings below.

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDING PROGRAMS

As previously indicated, the total reponse rate for the questionnaire was extremely high -- 93%, 100%, and 95% for NANEAP, LAC and Africa region countries, respectively. As a result, the survey results may be considered virtually complete for all training sites having ongoing language programs at the time the survey was conducted.

For the first survey question, asking for the identification of any individuals completing "any part of this questionnaire" (on a "check all that apply" basis), slightly less than half of the respondents (41%) indicated that a single individual had completed the entire questionnaire. The most frequently cited respondent was the associate Peace Corps director (in 24% of the reporting centers), followed by the language coordinator (12%), and more distantly by the Peace Corps director (5%). The associate Peace Corps director, working together with the language coordinator, was the most frequently indicated "combination" grouping (13%), and various other combinations were reported with appreciably smaller percentages. (NOTE: Unless otherwise indicated, reported percentages are based on all centers that provided a codeable response to that particular question (i.e., omitting any non-interpretable or "no response" cases from the percentage base). When the number of such cases exceeds 10% of the total number of centers in the survey sample (i.e., when the base N of valid responses drops below 38), the total number of cases on which the given percentages are based is shown in parentheses).

For the responding group of 41 countries, a total of 26 languages were indentified as the "primary" language being taught in the program. These consisted of Arabic (at 4 centers), French (11), Spanish (7), and--at one center each--Bahasa Malaysia, Chichewa, Fijian, Krio, Liberian English, Kosraen, Mandinka, Marshallese, Nepali, Paluan, (Solomon Islands) Pijin, Ponapean, Samoan, Sesotho, Setswana, siSwati, Tagalog (and other Philippine), Thai, Tongan, Trukese, Ulithian, Twi, Yapese. Secondary languages (where applicable), were identified as Bambara, Ewe, Fijian, Fang, Fanta, Fon, Hausa, Guaraní, Kpelle, Krio, Mandingo, Mano, Mayan, Mende, Mooré, Quechua, Spanish and Wolof.

The number of separate language training programs (defined as having at least five trainees each) conducted within the past two years at the training sites ranged from 1-59, with an average of 7. One to eleven language programs within the past two years was reported by 90% of the responding centers.

Except for three sites, which reported their most recent language training course as having been completed in September 1980, all sites indicated that their most recently completed course had ended at some time from November 1980 to May 1981. In an attempt to determine whether the "most-recently-completed" class could be considered typical of classes conducted in that program over the recent past, a series of "yes"/"no" questions were asked as follows:

> Were most of the other language training programs given in the past two years in this country similar to the current program in the following ways? (Check YES or NO for each statement.)

Most language training programs were about the same length.
The same language(s) were taught.
The language training courses had about the same number of full-time instructors.
The total number of trainees was similar.
The ages of the trainees were similar.

The number of males and females was similar.
They were trained for similar jobs.
The ratio of instructors per class size was about the same.

The great majority of respondents indicated that their language programs during this period were about the same length (85%), that the same languages were taught (92%), and that there was about the same student/instructor ratio (90%). The most salient difference was in the location of the training: only 33% of the respondents indicated that the language courses over the past two years were "taught at the same location." Written comments to this question strongly reinforced the frequent changes in training site, for example: "[country] doesn't have a fixed training center"; "we change the training site for every program"; "the sites were different for reasons of climate"; "village base was moved each time"; "language training sites have changed for every training program and so have the villages in which 'live-ins' were conducted"; "we have no fixed site -- must negotiate each time." Responses to the remaining items in this question were considered as possibly spurious to some extent in that the respondents may have tended to interpret the items very literally, rather than from the more general perspective intended. For example, the fact that "yes" responses of only 55% were received for "the number of males and females was similar" is probably attributable to very careful "head-counting" of the contingents, rather than to a fundamental change across training classes in the male-female ratio.

LANGUAGE TRAINING PROGRAM FUNDING, FACILITIES, AND SUPPLIES

About two-thirds of the centers responding to the questionnaire (68%) felt that "the current Peace Corps budget [provides] for adequate language training program staffing, materials, and training facilities." Centers responding "no" to this question indicated in their write-in comments that additional funds were needed for instructor training (4 centers), materials development (5), audiovisual equipment and other related materials (7), hiring of additional language teachers (1), provision of a permanent language coordinator (1), funds to "send instructor to RTRO" (1), to bring in outside consultants (1), and to develop a language training library (1). In the free-response question near the end of the questionnaire, "What additional support services would it be helpful for Peace Corps/Washington to provide for your language training program?" larger training budgets were cited by only four respondents and new facilities and equipment by two.

At most of the training sites visited during the in-field trips, the administrative and language staff were of the opinion that the budget allocated to the language training program was at least adequate for the needs of the program. With the exception of some small and fairly "routine" insufficiences (e.g., not quite enough reference materials, cassette recorders, etc.), the financial resources were considered not to be a significant problem. The two major exceptions were two Africa region sites, both of which reported serious program restrictions attributed to an insufficient budget. (In one of these instances, an extremely shaky national economy added significantly to the financial problem.)

Classroom Facilities

A large majority of the respondents indicated that they could "usually locate adequate physical facilities for the language training classes" (83%). Although relatively few in number, the written negative comments to this question suggested rather strongly the existence of definite problems with the classroom facilities at the training centers in question. Typical comments included: "[The sites] lack adequate light, furniture, etc."; "classrooms are too few--we make do with partitions and outside classrooms"; "we have thatched classrooms exposed to all the elements"; "no permanent classrooms--dorms, library verandas, shade trees, etc. often serve as classrooms."

On-site observations of classroom facilities generally corroborated these questionnaire data. Although the observed classes were for the most part being held indoors in regular classrooms or other rooms fitted out for classroom service, considerably more makeshift locations were being used in several cases, including kitchen areas (4 instances), inside a church (2 instances), and at various outside locations, including "on logs under tree" (3) and on outside porches, verandas, or passageways (6). Outside locations were noted by the on-site observers as especially prone to noise, as indicated by observer comments such as "This class is held in the center of the site, with all kinds of activity (including construction) going on all around--trucks, motorcycles." One indoor language class was being conducted in an operating auto repair garage.

Classroom seating arrangements observed on-site included for the most part semi-circular or circular seating, followed by classes held around a table (all logical and convenient arrangements for small group work). In only three instances was traditional "row-by-row" seating observed. As commented on by the observers, the chairs or other types of seats were at least adequately comfortable for the most part; in one instance, the use of extremely low and soft lounge-type chairs was cited as a negative factor, making trainee alertness and concentration difficult.

Basic classroom materials needed to support the language program (pencils, tablets, chalk, erasers, etc.) were considered by the questionnaire respondents to be in adequate supply in 100% of the responding training sites. This was corroborated by the on-site visits, in which, with the exception of one site which used flip charts, blackboards were available in the classroom or class area. Direct observation also confirmed the general availability of posters, photographs, calendars, drawings, maps, alphabet charts, and other similar realia.

Audiovisual Equipment

With regard to audiovisual and other equipment at the training site, a series of questions were asked concerning the availability, extent of use, general condition, and ease of repair of each of several types of equipment. Complete percentage responses for each question/equipment-type combination are shown in Appendix A; the most salient findings are described briefly below.

(1) Of the three types of reproduction equipment--xerox, mimeograph, and spirit stencil ("ditto")--mimeograph equipment is by far more frequently available on-site than is either of the other two types of equipment.

(2) Language laboratory facilities are for the most part not available to the reporting centers. Only four centers indicated that they had access to

such facilities either on-site or locally.

(3) Tape recorders of the cassette variety are much more available, both on-site and locally, than reel-to-reel recorders. (Cassette recorders were reported as on hand at 89% of the responding training programs.)

(4) Motion-picture projectors are available at about half of the responding sites (53%); video playback recorders are considerably less common (14%).

On-site visits suggested rather strongly that audiovisual equipment is not being widely used in those centers observed. The observers were asked to make note, on the observation form, of any tape recorders, projectors, or other similar equipment present in the classroom, whether or not this equipment was actually used during the class. Across 132 language classes observed, one mention each was made of the presence, in the classroom, of a cassette recorder, television set, slide projector, and film projector. In no instance was this equipment observed in use during the class.

Replacement supplies for the reproduction equipment (stencils, chemicals, paper, etc.) were considered adequate by 93% of the questionnaire respondents; somewhat fewer (70%) considered that they had an adequate supply of replacement items for the audiovisual equipment (blank cassettes, projector bulbs, etc.).

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDENT TRAINEES

The age distribution and other basic characteristics of the trainees in the "most recently completed language program," as characterized by the questionnaire respondents, are shown in Table 1. Although these respondent-reported data may not be quite as accurate as those that could be obtained through the direct inspection of relevant records (e.g., trainee rosters), they may be considered adequately indicative for purposes of the survey.

Across all reporting sites, an appreciable majority of trainees in the language classes (69%) are age 25 or younger, and virtually 9 out of 10 (89%) are below age 36. Only one trainee (on average) is reported as being between age 36 and 50, and 1.1 as being 51 or older. The male-female ratio is approximately identical (11.4 and 10.9, respectively).

Table 1

Characteristics of Trainees in Most Recently Completed Language Program

	Mean	S.D.	Range	No. of Sites Reporting
Trainees Per Program	23.3	14.6	5-60	41
Age 25 or under	16.0	11.5	3-45	40
Age 26 - 35	4.8	3.8	0-18	40
Age 36 - 50	1.0	1.4	0-5	40
Age 51 or over	1.1	1.4	0-6	40
Male	11.4	7.6	2-30	39
Female	10.9	7.6	0-33	39
No undergraduate education	0.9	1.4	0-5	41
Some college or undergraduate degree	20.0	13.9	2-54	41
More than undergraduate degree	2.7	5.7	0-35	40

With regard to the trainees' educational level, the great majority were reported as having "either some college education or an undergraduate degree" (86%). "More than an undergraduate degree" was reported for 12% of the trainees. Across responding centers, only 4% of the trainees were characterized as having "no undergraduate education."

DURATION AND SCHEDULING OF LANGUAGE CLASSES

Questionnaire data, as well as on-site observations, indicated that in most instances a highly intensive program of language training was being conducted, insofar as the number and distribution of classroom contact hours was concerned. To the question "How many days a week did the language classes regularly meet?" (See Table 2) one site reported a four-day-per-week schedule and one a seven-day schedule. The great majority reported that language classes were held either 5 or 6 days per week (jointly comprising 91% of responding sites).

Table 2

Reported Scheduling of Language Classes

Hours per Day	Sites Reporting	
2	2	(5%)
3	2	(5%)
4	9	(23%)
5	6	(15%)
6	19	(49%)
7	1	(3%)
	39	

Days per Week	Sites Reporting	
4	1	(3%)
5	15	(38%)
6	22	(56%)
7	1	(3%)
	39	

Days Classes Held	Sites Reporting	
Sunday	4	(10%)
Monday	40	(98%)
Tuesday	40	(98%)
Wednesday	41	(100%)
Thursday	41	(100%)
Friday	39	(95%)
Saturday	27	(66%)
	41	

With respect to the days of the week on which classes were held, only 4 programs (10% of the respondents) reported Sunday language study; about two-thirds (66%) indicated that classes were held on Saturday. Of these, several write-in comments noted that the number of class hours were reduced somewhat on Saturday. Virtually all centers reported language classes on each of the regular week days (Monday: 98%, Tuesday: 98%, Wednesday: 100%, Thursday: 100%, Friday: 95%).

The most typical number of hours-per-day of classroom language study was 6 (47% of respondents). Two centers offered only 2 hours of language classes daily and two offered 3 hours; in all four cases, the languages taught were uncommon local languages. Eighty-eight percent of the respondents reported that they offered from 4 to 7 classroom hours per day.

The total number of class hours spent in language study was addressed by the question "Approximately how many instructor-student classroom hours did a given trainee receive during the total language training course [for primary and for secondary languages separately]?" As shown in Table 3, the mean total classroom hours for the primary language was 172, and for the secondary language (where applicable), 56. However, considerable variation in this figure was noted across sites. For the primary language, reported total classroom hours ranged from 30 (Belizian Creole) to 340 (a site teaching Arabic). For secondary languages, the corresponding ranges were from 10 (one site teaching a Pidgin English and one teaching French as secondary to the major local language) to 180 (one site teaching a variety of local languages that were being taught virtually as intensively as the primary language [French]).

Table 3

Total Reported Contact Hours of Instruction

	Mean Hours	S.D.	Range
Primary Language (N=37)	18.1	83	30-340
Secondary Language (N=13)	68.0	49	10-180

It is interesting to compare the preceding scheduling data which the sites reported as their actual practice to their suggested "ideal" scheduling arrangement, as indicated by responses to the question, "In your opinion, about how many hours per day for how many days a week for how many weeks is ideal for the following trainees in a language training program? (Please estimate.)" As shown in Table 4, the mean judged "optimum number" of hours per day of language instruction for all three types of students queried ("trainees with some college training," "trainees with little academic background," and "older trainees") --5.4, 5.4, 4.6 hours per day --is generally in keeping with reported practice for the total trainee group (Table 2), except that the average recommended number of hours per day for "older trainees" is slightly lower (4.1). Optimum mean number of days per week for both college and "little academic background" trainees (5.5) are on average essentially identical to the reported practice for the total trainee group (5.6); the judged "optimum" mean number of days for older trainees is again slightly lower. Total "optimum" number of weeks of instruction ranges from an average of 9.3 for trainees with some college background to 10.4 for "little academic background" trainees and 10.8 for "older" trainees.

INSTRUCTOR SELECTION, TRAINING, AND EVALUATION

A major section of the questionnaire dealt with the initial selection and subsequent training and evaluation of the language instructor staff on-site. With respect to the person or persons responsible for selecting the language instructors (on a "check all that apply" basis), the language coordinator was most frequently indicated (80%), followed at a considerably lower percentage by "the Peace Corps staff" (41%), "an outside contractor" (32%), and "the more experienced language instructors" (17%). Written-in "other" persons involved in instructor selection included the training coordinator/director (3 instances), center director (2), project director (1), representatives of the Ministry of Education in the country (1), "language instructor trainers who've attended at least 2 TOT's" (1), and "human resource development officer" (1). Interviewing and hiring of language instructors on the basis of recommendations by volunteers was also cited by two programs.

Table 4

Judged Optimum Language Training Schedule[1]

		Hours per Day	Days per Week	No. of Weeks
For trainees with some college training:	Mean	5.4	5.5	9.3
	S.D.	1.0	0.7	2.6
	Range	3-7	3-6	4-16
	N	37	37	37
For trainees with little academic background:	Mean	5.4	5.5	10.4
	S.D.	1.0	0.7	3.9
	Range	2-7	3-6	4-25
	N	34	34	34
For older trainees:	Mean	4.6	5.3	10.8
	S.D.	1.4	1.1	5.5
	Range	2-6	2-6	4-30
	N	35	35	35

[1] Values shown are mean values across sites.

Availability of Instructors

With respect to the "general availability" of language instructors at the training site, 59% of the sites reported that "more instructor candidates are available than are needed for the program," "24% indicated that "there are enough instructors but no surplus," and 17% considered it "difficult to obtain enough instructors." However, the time of the year at which the training program was in operation was considered a critically important factor in instructor availability. Over three-quarters (77%) of the respondents indicated that there were "certain times of the year when language instructors are more available than at other times." Written comments to this question almost unanimously identified the yearly academic vacation period (and other academic holidays) as the time when language instructors could be most easily obtained, with considerably more difficulty encountered during the regular school term. Typical comments were: "Most language instructors are school teachers and thus not as available during school terms. We usually have to hold language classes from 4-6 p.m. in order to use the most qualified and experienced teachers"; "The school year in [country] is from February-November. During this time it is all but impossible to find good instructors"; "98% of our [teacher] candidates are available only during July-September due to their duties as government teachers during the school year." Project staff discussions with language coordinators and other on-site personnel generally reinforced these observations; a related concern strongly expressed at one site was the 180-day limit of employment per fiscal year of non full-time staff working for the Peace Corps. As a consequence, part-time language instructors are unable to work in more than two training programs per year, leading to the considerable additional expense of retraining new language instructors much more often than would be the case in the absence of the 180-day service limitation.

Instructor Backgrounds and Qualifications

Questionnaire items concerning the personal characteristics and qualifications of the language instructors provided the following results (figures are average percentages across responding sites):

93% have native proficiency in the language

78% have had some previous teaching experience

95% are citizens of the host country

1% are United States citizens

2% are citizens of another foreign country

64% have had previous experience teaching the target language in the Peace Corps

39% have had previous experience teaching the target language outside the Peace Corps

40% have a university or college degree.

These data would tend to indicate that Peace Corps language instructors are with only few exceptions host country nationals who are native speakers of the target language. With respect to the amount of prior experience in teaching the target language, roughly 60% of the instructors (across sites) would not have had any such teaching experience outside of the Peace Corps, presumably placing a major burden on the Peace Corps instructor training program to develop the necessary informational background and teaching skills on the part of these instructors. On the assumption that "previous experience teaching the target language in the Peace Corps" would have been interpreted by the respondents as the instructors' having taught in prior training contingents within that program, the positive response figure of only 64% would suggest a rather considerable language course-by-language course influx of teachers having no prior experience in Peace Corps language training, again placing a considerable burden on the instructor-training program.

Training of New Instructors

Virtually all (98%) of the responding programs reported that newly hired language instructors are given specific training before they begin teaching at the site. (The single exception was a small program with only one full-time and one part-time instructor.) However, as shown in Table 5, there is great variation in the total number of contact hours of preliminary training. With the exception of one extremely atypical site, which reported 504 preliminary hours of training, the total hours of training ranged from 7 to 96, with a mean of 37 (N=35). Eleven percent (4) of the sites reported providing only 7 or 8 hours of preliminary training (presumably only a single day) for a newly-hired teacher.

Table 5

Hours of Preliminary Training for Language Instructors

Total Hours	No. of Sites	Percent of Sites	Cum. Pct.
Less than 10	4	11%	11%
10-20	0	0%	11%
21-30	4	11%	22%
31-40	9	26%	48%
41-50	4	11%	59%
51-60	4	11%	70%
61-70	2	6%	76%
71-80	6	17%	93%
81-96[1]	2	6%	99%
	35		

---

[1] Does not include one site reporting 504 hours.

Pre-classroom training for the instructors is provided most frequently by the language coordinator (83%), working individually or in conjunction with other staff. "More experienced language instructors" are involved in this process at 46% of the centers, with appreciably lesser involvement by the Peace Corps director (29%), outside language contractor (24%), or other outside consultants (15%). Written-in "other" responses included the project director (1 site), training center director (4), "human resource development officer" (1), PCV's with teaching experience (1), and assistant training coordinator (1).

Brief written descriptions of the training program conducted for language instructors were requested of the survey respondents. These descriptions reveal considerable variety in approach but include, in virtually all cases, instructional sessions devoted to the particular methodology(ies) used at the site, as well as orientation procedures intended to introduce the teacher to the history and purpose of the Peace Corps, the characteristics of the trainees, and their language-learning expectations. Practice teaching was cited as a component of instructor training in 16 centers.

Evaluation of Instructors

The great majority of respondents indicated that there were "regular procedures for reviewing or evaluating language instructors once they are hired" (85%). To the write-in question, "Please describe who conducts the evaluation and how it is done," a variety of responses were obtained. In 26 instances, the language coordinator was identified as involved in evaluation, either individually or in cooperation with other persons. Evaluation by the project director was considerably less frequently cited (3 instances), as were evaluation by Peace Corps staff (2) and the more experienced language instructors (1). Almost half of the respondents (20) wrote in that the trainees themselves had a formal role in the evaluation of instructors, typically through rating forms filled out on as often as weekly basis. The FSI ratings attained by the students were cited in three instances as one component of the instructor's evaluation, and "self-evaluation" by the instructor was mentioned in two cases. One written response suggested a substantial misunderstanding of the role of the certified FSI testers on-site: "Five of our language trainers were certified by ETS as qualified language trainers. They select and do periodic evaluations of other language trainers."

Wide variation was noted in the frequency of evaluation of the instructors. Three centers reported "yearly" evaluations, 9 indicated that these evaluations were carried out at the end of each language program (two reported twice per program), and 8 conducted teacher evaluations on a weekly basis. "Continuous" evaluation was reported as taking place in 9 centers.

TEACHING MATERIALS

Questions in this section asked for identification of the kinds of teaching materials used in the language training program and an indication of the degree of satisfaction with these materials. Textbooks and locally-prepared handouts were the most frequently reported materials (85% in both instances), followed by "local newspapers or magazines" at the surprisingly high frequency of 61%. The use of audiotapes or cassettes was reported at 56% of the centers, with somewhat less use of "films or other visual materials" (41%); these figures are consistent with the relative availability of cassette recorders and film projectors as indicated in an earler section of the questionnaire.

Spaces were provided for the respondent to give the name and other publication information for up to three textbooks used in the language program. Of the 33 centers supplying information concerning their textbook(s), 15 listed a single text, 4 listed 2 texts, and 14 made note of three. Of the total of 65 texts listed, author/publication data indicated that 22 were from regular U.S. publishers, 6 were produced in the host country apparently independently of the Peace Corps (e.g., ministry of education or other government agency), and 29 were produced by ACTION/Peace Corps, either in-country or in the U.S. (There was insufficient information to make a determination in 8 cases.)

To the evaluative question "Are you satisfied with the current language training materials, 51% of the centers reported "yes" and 49%, "no". Written comments concerning needed training materials included in several instances technical and job-specific materials to supplement the basic text. One program considered that it needed a "totally new and comprehensive text," two others, a complete "training package," and another site also appeared to have substantial materials needs: "...Sequenced text to integrate grammar, communication and culture handbook and special skills handbook with supplementary materials, tests, quizzes, tapes, visuals, and slides to accompany the new text for speaking, listening, reading and writing."

LANGUAGE PROGRAM GOALS

Several items in the questionnaire were intended to determine whether the responding language programs had developed specific language/communication/cultural goals to guide their training efforts, the general nature of these goals, the way(s) in which success in attaining the goals was determined, and follow-up activities in the event that the specified goals were not met.

To the question, "who assesses the language training needs and sets the language training goals at this site? (Check all that apply.)," the following responses, in decreasing order of selection, were received.

Language coordinator (90%)
APCD Staff (76%)
Peace Corps Director (56%)
"Other" (44%) [Responses included "project director (2 mentions), training director/training coordinator (7), technical training staff (1), human resource development officer (1), and feedback from PCV's in the field (4).]
Peace Corps/Washington (2%)

Written Performance Goals

Over eight out of ten of the reporting centers (83%) indicated that they had developed a written statement of the basic language/communication/cultural goals for the pre-service language program. Centers responding affirmatively were asked to include a copy of the goal statement along with the returned questionnaire. Centers that had not, as of that time, prepared a written goal statement were asked to "please state [on the questionnaire] what the goals of the language training program appear to be."

Of the 33 centers indicating that they had previously prepared written goal statements for the pre-service training, 21 included copies of these statements with the returned questionnaire (or forwarded them with other materials). Review of these statements indicated that they varied widely in orientation and in degree of detail provided. Some goal statements were cast almost entirely in terms of score levels and score increases on the FSI scale, and others specified a minimum anticipated FSI level, coupled with task-oriented descriptions of expected proficiency (e.g., [demonstrate] his or her ability to discuss in French why he or she came to [country], what his or her job entails, and what he or she hopes to give and to gain from two years as a PCV....[demonstrate] an ability to communicate on an acceptable level, in [language], with government officials...." Other goal statements were found to combine both functional/situational elements (e.g., "order meals, seek lodging, call and conduct a meeting") and strictly linguistic objectives ("[use] verbs in three tenses in the active and at least one passive form").

Goal statements that responding centers wrote into the questionnaire (i.e., there being no prior written goal statements) were generaly quite short and were expressed either in terms of a desired end-of-training FSI level or in very general functional terms (e.g., "to bring the trainee to a level of language proficiency necessary to do his/her job").

Satisfaction with Established Goals

To the question, "are you satisfied with the present arrangement for defining language needs and goals at this site?," 71% of the respondents indicated "yes" and 29% "no." A variety of written comments explaining the negative judgments were received, including the need at one center to have the goals "written down formally," the observation that "in-country permanent staff has little time to evaluate needs and set goals for multiple skills tracks," and that more attention should be paid to "in-field job activities." Two other comments also stressed the need to be more precise and more detailed in analyzing language requirements in the field: "We need more precise input from field about what actual needs are -- more precise definitions of goals for [each] program"; "up to now, we have no scientific method of assessing needs (voc. ed. training needs have been better assessed) and the establishment of written goals, apart from the FSI requirement, remains to be done." One site indicated that they would like to get "host country involvement" in defining the language goals.

FSI Scores as Performance Goals

Regardless of the presence of absence of written end-of-training language goals, the respondents were asked to indicate whether there was a specified "target" level on the FSI scale that the trainees should meet by the completion of the program. Approximately 8 out of 10 respondents (79%) stated that this was the case insofar as their primary language was concerned. For centers also teaching a secondary language, the situation was reversed, with only 37% reporting an established FSI level for the second language (base N=19).

Of the 28 centers which wrote in, as requested, their established FSI level for pre-service training, the distribution of levels was as follows (for the primary language):

FSI Level	Number of Programs
1	1
1+	14
2	9
2+	4
	28

Only 6 centers supplied the established target level for the secondary language, and the number of cases is considered insufficient to draw representative conclusions. (As a matter of general information, one center each noted 1, 2, and 2+; three centers noted 1+.)

Written comments to the question, "how were the [FSI] level or levels established?" showed a variety of backgrounds and rationales. In four instances, the source of the decision was indicated as either not known or simply in keeping with prior training custom. One such comment was "Basically because of tradition. No sound research of 'correct' target levels has been carried out." One respondent indicated that the goal level established was a function of available instructional time, in that "[1+] is generally the highest level it is possible to achieve in a 10-week course with a heavy cross-cultural component." In other instances, the comments showed detailed attempts to relate the target FSI levels to job performance adequacy in the field, for example, "FSI 2 found to be minimum necessary for satisfactory performance in jobs where subject (Voc. Ed.) is taught in [language]. TEFLers need FSI 1+ for daily living needs."

Established target level scores on "any other kind of test" than the FSI for end-of-training language assessment were reported by 10 centers for the primary language and 2 for the secondary language. In two instances, the test in question was found, very desirably, to be a work-sample of actual communication situations in which the trainee would later be engaged: "Practice teaching evaluated by the Federal School Inspectorates"; "demo lesson in [language] for voc. ed. trainers with class of real students." In a few other instances, the testing procedure appeared to be considerably less relevant (e.g., a "written test" on which a passing score of 70% was required).

With regard to the FSI scores observed on entry to the training program, the average entry score reported for the primary language ranged (across reporting programs) as follows:

FSI Score	Number of Programs
0	18
0+	6
1	5
1+	3
3	1
	33

Average entry scores for the secondary language were uniformly reported as "0" (across 14 reporting centers).

With respect to end-of-training scores, the reported average end of training scores for the primary language concentrated between 1+ and 2, as follows:

FSI Score	Number of Programs
1	2
1+	14
2	14
2+	5
	35

For the secondary language, the most frequently reported average end-of-training score was 1:

FSI Score	Number of Programs
0+	2
0+	1
1	5
1+	3
2	1
2+	1
	13

On a very general basis, and subject to a number of possible reservations concerning the degree of accuracy and objectivity of the reported data (and including the very real possibility of subjectively different understanding of the FSI scale itself across programs), it would appear from these responses that the end-of-training FSI scores obtained by the training participants are on an overall basis generally in line with the level of proficiency considered minimally adequate for job-related activities in the field.

INSTRUCTIONAL APPROACHES AND ACTIVITIES

Both the general instructional approaches used in the language training programs and the more detailed activities carried out in the classrooms were addressed in the survey from a number of perspectives. With respect to information to be obtained from the survey questionnaire, a series of items was prepared concerning the extent to which certain major types of language learning activities were incorporated in the training program (e.g., formal classroom instruction, total or partial immersion, courses in other subjects taught in the target language, coordination of language instruction with technical training or with training in culture and customs of the host country). Respondents were also asked to identify which particular training methodology or methodologies (audiolingual, direct method, counseling-learning, etc.) they considered themselves to be using in the language program. Third, to obtain more detailed information about particular classroom activities than would be available from a simple identification of methodologies (as well as to attempt to verify the accuracy of the respondents' characterization of the methodologies), a fairly lengthy series of possible instructional activities or procedures (63 in total) were listed in the questionnaire, with the instruction to the respondent to indicate the relative frequency with which that activity or procedure was used in the language classes. Examples of these items are "Instructor introduces new vocabulary in context (for example, as part of a dialogue)"; "Trainees are given pseudonyms which they use in the language class"; "In the classroom, periods of silence are used during which the trainees reflect on the material being learned." In addition to examining the overall frequency with which each of these activities was reported, it was intended to characterize the degree to which the particular configurations of activities implicit in each of a variety of recognized methodologies would be exemplified in these data.

On-site Visit Data

Information on instructional practices obtained during the on-site visits was intended to serve as a cross-check on the questionnaire-based data, as well as to provide additional training-related information. The basic sources of on-site information on classroom activities/procedures included the observation form notations concerning classroom "focus," extent of target language use by instructor and trainee, and other items on the front page of this form, as well as the set of 56 descriptions of instructional activities drawn verbatim from the corresponding section of the survey questionnaire. Data from these sources will be presented later in this section.

General Instructional Practices

A series of items in the survey questionnaire presented ten general language training activities, which the respondents were to mark either as "not used" during the most recently completed training program or, if used, to indicate whether that activity was considered "of major importance," "of some importance," or "of minor importance." The average percentage of responses for each activity/rating combination is shown in Appendix A. For ease of discussion, the ten activities are listed below in order of frequency with which they were identified as of "major importance" across the responding centers:

Formal classroom language instruction	100%
"Homestays" with host country families (weekends or longer)	78%
Total language immersion (trainees speak only the target language at all times)	61%
Role-playing situations	48%
Individual language tutoring	40%
Modified language immersion (trainees speak in the target language for limited specified times)	36%
Courses in other subjects taught in the target language	29%
Lectures or other formal presentations by host country nationals in target language	19%
Optional language laboratory practice	--
Required language laboratory practice	--
(For both of the preceding questions, the large number of "not used" responses make percentage figures questionable.)	

From the above figures, and as would be anticipated, regular classroom instruction was universally considered of major importance as an instructional approach at the responding sites. "Homestay" contacts with native speakers of the target language (and presumably involving extensive language use in genuine communicative situations) was reported as of major importance in about 8 out of 10 training programs, followed by total language immersion, anticipated to involve continual target language use by trainees both among themselves and with native speakers on-site. Role-playing situations, approximating within the classroom various real-life language use settings, were also frequently cited. Consistent with the general unavailability of language laboratory facilities at the training sites, language laboratory practice is for all intents and purposes not a factor in Peace Corps language training overall.

The question cited above on "courses in other subjects taught in the target language" had been intended to address the teaching of other components of pre-service training (for example, technical training subjects, cultural orientation classes) via the target language. To the extent that respondents may not have considered cultural orientation or other classes actually being taught in the target language to represent "courses in other subjects" (such as, for example, mathematics, history, etc.), the 29% response may be an underestimate of the extent to which the target language was being used as a vehicle for instruction in other aspects of the on-site training.

A related question, "Was the language training integrated with any of the following areas? (Check all that apply)", produced the following results:

Culture and customs of host country	98%
Technical training related to the trainees' work assignment	85%
Health and sanitation	54%
Other	15%

The virtually unanimous indication that "culture and customs" of the host country were integrated with the language training would be presumed to include both culturally-related discussion in the course of the language classes themselves and instructional sessions explicitly addressed to these topics. By the same token, the high level of integration of "technical training" could reflect both technical classes taught in the target language and a variety of other activities taking place within the language classroom (for example, presentation of work-related vocabulary.) The three "other" responses to this question were "village technology," "instruction in development," and "social aspects."

To the question, "Was the instructional approach or the content of the language training modified or directed toward the type of job trainees will be doing?, 88% of the responses were in the affirmative. By far the most frequently reported modification was the incorporation of job-related technical terms and other job-related vocabulary, mentioned by 25 of the responding centers (two typical responses: "Technical vocabulary was built into dialogues and special technical language classes were set by program"; "The language program includes 'technical language' directly related to the volunteers' jobs which becomes a priority during the last 5 weeks of training. The content is closely based on their technical training and suggestions from volunteers in the field").

The use of "language packets" specific to the job assignment was mentioned in one instance, and job-related role-playing was also mentioned on several occasions. One center indicated that "technical vocabulary was built into dialogues, and special technical language classes were set up by program." One site conducting training in Arabic described its program as involving training in Arabic script, followed by general language training, and completed with 38 hours of technical language "based on assessed needs after field visits and study of ministerial documents."

Reported Methodologies

The survey question addressed to determining the self-reported method or methods of language teaching used in the local program was phrased as follows:

Which one or more of the following language training methodologies were used [in the most recently completed course]? (check all that apply.)

Audiolingual
Suggestopedia
Physical-Response Method
Counseling-Learning/
Community Language Learning
Direct Method
Silent Way
Traditional (Grammar-Translation)

An immediate and rather significant outcome was that only 5 training centers indicated that they used a single method exclusively (Audiolingual: 2 responses, Direct Method: 2, Silent Way: 1). In all other instances, the use of two more more methodologies was reported. The figures below show the percentages of centers that indicated any use of the methodology in question:

Audiolingual	76%
Direct Method	61%
Counseling-Learning/ Community Language Learning	56%
Silent Way	49%
Traditional (Grammar-Translation)	41%
Physical-Response	22%
Suggestopedia	7%

Written-in comments to the associated question, "If more than one methodology was used, please explain how this was done." showed considerable diversity, both in the responses themselves and in the underlying rationales stated in (or that could be inferred from) the replies. In several instances, the integration of methodologies was clearly and succinctly described, and could be considered indicative of deliberate prior planning and implementation (for example, "Audiolingual initially for instruction with final 2 weeks of each track Community Language Learning. Direct Method used about 3 hrs./week in covering grammar points." More typically, however, only general references were made to "an eclectic approach" intended to "meet the needs of the learners." In a number of cases, the particular backgrounds and capabilities of the instructors were implicitly among the determining factors in the selection of methodology (for example, "Primary language used Silent Way until went past instructors' training level in method. Then continued in Counseling-Learning and Community Language Learning"). Other responses in this vein included "There were 8 different instructors, some of whom felt more comfortable with one method than another" and "Direct method was used--since teachers were of the traditional type, classroom instruction tended toward the traditional grammatical explanations."

To the question, "If some other language training methodology not listed was used, please describe," the "cognitive" method was referred to by one respondent; "situational reinforcement" and "community learning experiences," 4 times each; and "critical incidents" and one-on-one tutorials, twice each.

Responses to the questionnaire items dealing with the identification of methodologies used on-site must be interpreted with caution in light of the possibility (or indeed, probability) that a number of respondents would not be highly familiar with the terminology for each of the methods listed and as a result may have interpreted some of these labels in an idiosyncratic way when attempting to reference them against their own language programs. It is considered that a more detailed and more objective analysis of the instructional procedures actually used at the training sites is provided through the analysis of relative frequencies of use of the specific instructional activities listed in the "instructional approaches and activities" section of the survey questionnaire. These results are described immediately below.

Specific Classroom Activities

During the initial development of the survey questionnaire, and with the assistance of the two project consultants, a list of 63 separate classroom teaching activities (or in a few instances, instructional orientations directly related to classroom practice, such as "Any reading or writing that is done is based on what the trainees have practiced orally first") was prepared. Included in this list were a number of activities specifically associated with a particular methodology--e.g., "Emphasis is placed on having comfortable, relaxed surroundings during the language class," considered a fundamental characteristic of the suggestopedic method as elaborated in its ideal or "pure" form; or "Instructor issues commands for physical actions, which the trainees then carry out," a hallmark of the "total physical response" approach--as well as activities characteristic of more than one approach but not applicable to all teaching methodologies (for example, "The target language is used exclusively by the instructor and trainees; English is not permitted", which is generally characteristic of the audiolingual, total physical response, and direct methods but is not a tenet of the suggestopedic, counseling-learning, Silent Way, grammar-translation, or cognitive-code methods). A small number of activities within the total list that were of a more generalized nature and not readily identifiable as characteristic of a particular method or subset of methods (e.g., "Instructor reads printed texts aloud in class (for example, magazine articles, newspaper clippings, etc."); "Instructor uses photographs or drawings to elicit speech in the target language") were included for informational purposes. All of the 63 activity descriptions, in the deliberately randomized order in which they were presented in the questionnaire and showing the exact wording used in each instance, are reproduced in Appendix A.

For each classroom activity description, the questionnaire respondents were asked to indicate whether that activity was "frequently used," "occasionally used," or "rarely or never used" in the language training program at that site. Percentage responses obtained within each of these three response categories for each activity are shown in Appendix A.

To simplify discussion and interpretation, each of the 63 activities is reproduced in Table 6 below in order of decreasing frequency of "frequently" responses, based on all responding training sites. Also shown, in parentheses, are the particular instructional methodology or methodologies with which the activity is considered to be associated, using the following code:

Audiolingual (ALM)
Suggestopedia (SUG)
Total Physical Response (TPR)
Counseling-Learning/
  Community Language Learning (CL)
Direct Method (DM)
Silent Way (SW)
Grammar-Translation (GTR)
Cognitive Code (COG)

With regard to the least frequently reported activities, it may be noted that a basic procedure underlining the Total Physical Response method in its "official" or most authoritative form (cf. Asher, 1977)--"Trainees are discouraged from speaking until they are 'ready'; the listening-only period may last several weeks"--is marked as "rarely or never used" by all of the reporting

Table 6

Frequency of Use of Instructional Activities as Reported by Training Sites[1]

	O/F	Freq	Occ	R/N	ALM	SUG	TPR	CL	DM	SW	GTR	COG
57. Cultural features reflecting daily life in the host country are incorporated in dialogues or other classroom activities.	61%	93%	7%	0%	X	X			X			
1. Instructor introduces new vocabulary in context (for example, as part of a dialogue).	73	93	5	3	X	X			X			
24. The instructor immediately reinforces correct responses.	81	83	15	2	X							
8. Instructor provides pronunciation models for trainees to imitate (individually or in group).	85	83	13	5	X							
22. Any reading or writing that is done is based on what the trainess have practiced orally first.	13	80	18	3	X							
13. The instructor uses pre-arranged hand motions or other gestures to elicit and/or correct student responses.	42	79	15	5						X		
51. Trainees learn one grammatical structure at a time, in a carefully planned sequence.	73	78	15	8	X							
23. Instructor makes note of trainees' errors so as to adjust lesson planning.	8	76	17	7						X		
44. The instructor tries to prevent trainee errors by carefully sequencing and introducing new material.	NI	75	18	8	X							
2. The instructor uses dramatic techniques and props to make meanings clear or introduce new language materials.	57	72	26	3		X						

---

[1] Column figures show percentage of sites reporting "frequent," occasional," and "rarely or never" use. Column X's show instructional procedure category(ies) to which each activity assigned (See text for discussion.)

Table 6 (cont.)

		O/F	Freq	Occ	R/N	ALM	SUG	TPR	CL	DM	SW	GTR	COG
37.	Listening and speaking are taught first, followed by reading and writing.	NI	70	23	8	X							
10.	Instructor leads pattern-practice drills in class.	33	68	24	7	X							
21.	Instructor corrects student by repeating the word or phrase correctly (rather than by explicitly pointing out the error).	90	66	32	2			X	X				
34.	Free (unstructured) conversation is used in class.	29	66	29	5					X			
36.	Students are often divided into small groups to practice the language.	25	66	24	10				X				X
3.	Trainees often sit in a circle for classroom work.	45	66	20	15				X		X		
12.	Emphasis is placed on having comfortable, relaxed surroundings during the language class.	43	64	28	8		X						
56.	The vocabulary presented is directly related to the work the trainees will be doing.	27	63	33	5								
38.	Instructor uses photographs or drawings to elicit speech in the target language.	35	63	32	5								
5.	The target language is used exclusively by the instructor and trainees; English is not permitted.	61	32	7	93	X		X		X			
26.	After being presented a grammar rule trainees construct sentences using the rule.	40	61	22	17							X	X
60.	Trainees take part in role-playing situations to practice previously learned material.	21	59	39	2								X

Table 6 (cont.)

					A	S	T				G	C
					L	U	P	C	D	S	T	O
	O/F	Freq	Occ	R/N	M	G	R	L	M	W	R	G
25. Trainees create skits, dialogues, or other original material in the target language.	31	59	29	12		X	X					
47. In a group setting, trainees are encouraged to share and discuss their thoughts and feelings, using the target language.	5	59	29	12				X		x		
46. Trainees are encouraged to correct one another's errors.	27	56	34	10						x		
41. The instructor controls and directs the class as an "orchestra leader" of drills, student responses, etc.	70	56	32	12	X							
55. Trainees are prohibited from using English in class.	NI	56	24	20	X				X			
19. Instructor uses pantomime to explain what something means.	64	54	38	8	X	X			X			
31. In a group setting, trainees are encouraged to share and discuss their throughts and feelings about the learning process.	5	54	29	17				X		X		
62. Trainees are expected to learn grammar by observing patterns of structure and becoming aware of these patterns.	NI	51	37	12	X			X	X	X		
33. Trainee errors are used as a basis from which to demonstrate points of grammar.	NI	51	32	17								
53. Grammatical structures are introduced within the context of a particular language task (for example, "apologizing," "doubting," "requesting," etc.)	2	50	39	11								
48. The instructor is silent while the trainees are engaged in a group task.	25	49	44	7						X		

Table 6 (cont.)

	O/F	Freq	Occ	R/N	ALM	SUG	TPR	CL	DM	SW	GTR	COG
29. Instructor explains grammatical points, using target language.	54	46	39	15							X	X
28. Instructor uses activities designed to get trainees to express their own preferences or values.	NI	46	38	15				X				
39. The grammatical structures to be taught are selected according to their usefulness in the trainees' particular job assignments.	9	46	26	28								X
43. Trainees engage in rapid-fire oral drill.	20	45	43	13	X							
45. Compared to the students, the instructor speaks very little during the class.	5	45	43	13						X		
18. Trainees are given instruction in important nonverbal aspects of communication in the host country setting (for example, proper person-to-person distance during conversation, appropriate eye contact, etc.).	10	44	49	7					X			
9. Communicative games and/or problem-solving activities are used during the class period.	10	44	46	10						X		X
50. Trainees are given vocabulary lists with their translations.	9	40	43	18							X	
7. The instructor makes use of minimal pairs in teaching pronunciation.	7	40	38	23	X							
42. Trainees are allowed to suggest the material they want to learn in the target language.	7	39	51	10	X			X				
4. The instructor concentrates on one particular aspect of the language (for example, pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar) during a particular class hour.	28	39	41	20								

Table 6 (cont.)

		O/F	Freq	Occ	R/N	ALM	SUG	TPR	CL	DM	SW	GTR	COG
59.	Trainees are given specific instruction and practice in communicating in the target language by paraphrasing, using gestures, etc. in order to get around deficiences in vocabulary or grammar.	2	39	29	32								
17.	Instructor issues commands for physical actions, which the trainees then carry out.	20	36	49	15			X					
32.	Instructor encourages students to write original notes, paragraphs, letters, etc. in the target language.	13	34	46	20								
63.	Trainees are never given explicit grammar rules; they infer them from the examples provided.	46	33	31	36	X			X	X	X		
58.	Trainees learn songs in the target language.	2	32	49	20								
14.	Trainees are permitted to ask the instructor to give them the target language equivalents of English phrases or sentences they wish to express in the target language.	30	29	44	27				X				
49.	Rods and charts are used to introduce new language material.	5	28	36	36						X		
61.	Trainees translate from target language into English or vice versa.	16	27	41	32							X	
52.	Vocabulary lists are studied in class.	9	23	40	38							X	
11.	Instructor reads printed texts aloud in class (for example, magazine articles, newspaper clippings, etc.).	7	20	41	39								
16.	Trainees recite dialogues from memory.	13	20	39	41	X	X						

Table 6 (cont.)

	O/F	Freq	Occ	R/N	ALM	SUG	TPR	CL	DM	SW	GTR	COG
54. The instructor explains grammatical points, using English.	13	20	39	41							X	X
6. Trainees are given pseudonyms which they use in the language class.	38	18	21	62		X						
27. Reading and writing is given equal attention with listening and speaking.	NI	15	45	40		X		X	X			X
20. In the classroom, periods of silence are used during which the trainees reflect on the material being learned.	4	12	27	61				X				
35. Instructor plays tape recorded material to class for listening comprehension practice.	0	10	46	44								
30. Instructor gives dictation (reads target language sentences aloud which are written out in target language by trainees).	5	8	40	53								
15. Soft music is used as a background for classroom work.	0	2	7	90		X						
40. Trainees are discouraged from speaking until they are "ready"; the listening-only period may last several weeks.	1	0	0	100			X					

training sites. On the assumption that thoroughgoing adherence to this principle is an integral component of the TPR approach as this method would be best utilized in practice, the indications from these data are that a "pure" TPR approach is not being followed at any of the responding training centers. By the same token, an important aspect of the suggestopedic method as elaborated by its original developer (Lozanov, 1978)--the use of soft music as a background for classroom work--is indicated as "frequent" by only 2% of the respondents and as "occasional" by only 7% (corresponding to one and three sites, respectively). Again, thoroughgoing application of one of the basic procedures associated with this methodology does not appear to be taking place with any appreciable frequency across the Peace Corps sites surveyed.

With respect to the other activities considered instructional components of one or more of the 8 methodologies listed above, a rough indication of the relative frequency with which "Audiolingual," "Suggestopedic," and other activities were identified as taking place across sites may be obtained by noting the patterning of "x" marks in the corresponding columns of Table 6. For example, activities designated as Audiolingual in character are concentrated to some extent toward the top of the column, indicating generally greater reported use overall. This is not universally the case, however, since a number of Audiolingual activity descriptions are seen at appreciably lower percentages of "frequent" reported use (for example, "Trainees recite dialogues from memory," at 20% of "frequent" use.) By contrast, Grammar-Translation activities are concentrated in the lower portion of the percentage range, with "After being presented a grammar rule, trainees construct sentences using the rule" showing the highest percentage of "frequent" use (61%) of any Grammar-Translation activity. Cognitive-Code related activities show a generally similar patterning of relatively low frequency of use.

On-site Data on Classroom Activities

In addition to providing information on the particular instructional activities taking place within the classes visited, the on-site observation form contained, as previously described, spaces for the observer's use in judging several more general aspects of the instruction. One of these was the proportion of total class time during which the responsibility for class control (i.e., responsibility for determining and initiating the "next step" in the learning process) was with the instructor, the students, or shared between instructor and students. In 79 of 122 classroom reports, the instructor was judged as being "in control" during the entire class period; across these classes, the average percentage of class time during which activities were considered to be under instructor control was 96%. It should be borne in mind, however, that "instructor control" involves simply the teacher's guidance of the classroom activities, and does not imply that the students were not actively engaged in language production and practice during the class period.

At least some proportion of "student control" of the classroom process was noted in 17 instances (average percentage of class time: 32%), with 4 of these classes reported as having 50% or more of the time under student control. In three of these cases, the class was in the next to last week of the training program, with the activity in question being extensive oral presentations by the trainees on some aspect of their job assignment.

Use of English vs. target language. With few exceptions, instructors in the classes observed used the target language exclusively or almost exclusively during the class. At two LAC sites, Spanish was used in a total of 6 classes (with judged proportions of class time of from 5 to 50 percent) to explain various points during a local-language class (analogously to the use of English in a Spanish or French class). Not counting these cases, the percentages of class time during which the instructors used English rather than the target language ranged, across observations, from 2 to 60 percent, with an average of 4%. Two cases showing the highest (60%) and next highest (40%) of English use both involved review lessons on various features of local-language grammar.

In-class use of English by the trainees was reported as slightly more extensive overall than by the instructors (average of 6%, with a range of 2-70%). In all events, a substantial majority of classes were observed taking place entirely or virtually entirely in the target language: a total of 75 of the 132 classes observed were recorded as involving exclusive use of the target language by the teacher, coupled with at least 95% target-language use by the trainees.

Degree of structure of classroom activities. As indicated earlier, observer judgments of the "degree of structure" under which the class was operating were based on a three-part scale. "Structured" activities were those in which the "next step" was considered highly predictable (e.g., pattern practice drill, question/answer sessions, vocabulary review, etc.). "Semi-structured" activities were those showing some degree of planning on an overall basis but allowing for "expansion and digression" in the course of the activity. "Free conversation" was defined as conversation on topics brought up spontaneously by the teacher or trainees. As would be anticipated, "structured" activities were judged as most frequently involved in the classes observed (average of 76% of total class time), followed by "semi-structured" activities at an appreciably lower percentage (16%), and "free conversation" at a still lower figure (3%). Of the 22 classes showing any amount of free conversation, only 3 were at a level of 50% of class time or above. These figures do not, of course, reflect numerous opportunities for non-structured conversational practice which the trainees were routinely encountering outside of class. Also, since the majority of site visits took place at or near the beginning of the training classes observed, the observational results may not fully reflect the extent of semi-structured and free conversational activities taking place at a later point in the training program.

Focus of classroom activities. In 79 of the 132 classes observed, the focus of classroom activities was noted as being entirely "linguistic" in nature throughout the class period. A "functional" focus (defined as a setting in which the trainees were learning to carry out specified language "functions," such as complaining, requesting, agreeing, etc.) was noted in only 7 instances. A "topical" focus during at least a portion of the class period was somewhat more frequently indicated (total of 36 classes). The amount of class time spent in a "topical" mode varied from 5% to 90%, with an average of 30%. Included in the "topical" category are vocabulary study and other activites that involve learning the terms, structures, idiomatic expressions, etc. involved in "shopping," "transportation," or other general topical areas. A "situational" focus, in which the class is actively engaged in either live or simulated language-use situations, was reported with fairly low frequency (7 classes, with an average class-time proportion of 39%). Again, these figures may not be representative of classroom activities taking place at other points in the training sequence.

Degree of student involvement. For this item, the observer was asked to estimate the total percentage of class time during which the students appeared to be "consciously engaged in the learning process" (as opposed to inattentive or distracted). Across sites and classes, student involvement was, in general, noted as very high, with 79 classes judged as having 100% involvement on the students' part (average percentage: 96%). This figure is quite reasonable in view of the very small number of students per class, which would promote (and indeed, virtually dictate) close attention on the part of all participants.

"Cultural conflicts." As previously indicated, a space was provided on the observation form for the observer to make note of any perceived instances of "cultural conflict" between the instructor and students, defined as "any instances in which cross-cultural differences between teacher and students raised a barrier to communication or otherwise negatively affected the learning process." Across 132 observations, only two such notes were made, one relating to a situation in which the instructor's traditional European style of classroom control appeared to give rise to some mutual hostility, and one involving use of an American slang expression that was not "caught" by the instructor. In the great majority of cases, however, there were no apparent communication or interpersonal difficulties within the classroom setting that could be attributed to cultural differences *per se*.

Specific Classroom Activities Observed

As previously indicated, for each classroom observation on-site, the final step in the process was for the observer to enter on the back page of the observation form whether or not each of 56 possible classroom activities (for which the descriptions were reproduced verbatim from the "instructional approaches and activities" section of the survey questionnaire) had been carried out during that class session. The left-most column of Table 6, labeled O/F, shows the "observed frequency" of use of each activity as the percentage of classes visited in which any use of that activity was observed. For example, for item 1, "Instructor introduces new vocabulary in context (for example, as part of a dialogue)," this activity was noted by the observers as having taken place in 73% of the classes visited (N=132). The notation NI indicates that the designated activity (e.g., item 44, "The instructor tries to prevent trainee errors by carefully sequencing and introducting new material"), although appearing in the survey questionnaire, was not included on the classroom observation form because it was considered that information relating to this actitivy could not be obtained simply through short term classroom visits.

In general, a reasonably high degree of correspondence may be seen between the level of use of the specified classroom activities as indicated by the questionnaire respondents and the corresponding direct observation data. In comparing the percentage of observed use to the corresponding figure for "frequent" use as noted by the questionnaire respondents, several of the more discrepant items are seen to involve activities that could not be readily judged on-site (for example, "Instructor makes note of trainees' errors so as to adjust lesson planning") and that in retrospect would have been more advisedly omitted from the classroom observation form. In other cases, "observed" vs. "respondent-judged" differences in use frequency would not be considered to arise from this source, but would require some other interpretation. Such items include:

59. "Trainees are given specific instruction and practice in communicating in the target language by paraphrasing, using gestures, etc. in order to get around deficiencies in vocabulary or grammar."

Respondent-judged percentage of "frequent" use: 39%

Observed percentage of use: 2%

18. "Trainees are given instruction in important nonverbal aspects of communication in the host country setting (for example, proper person-to-person distance during conversation, appropriate eye contact, etc.)"

44%
10%

53. "Grammatical structures are introduced within the context of a particular language task (for example, "apologizing," "doubting," "requesting," etc.)."

50%

2%

31. "In a group setting, trainees are encouraged to share and discuss their thoughts and feelings about the learning process."

54%

5%

47. "In a group setting, trainees are encouraged to share and discuss their thoughts and feelings, using the target language."

59%

5%

These data must be interpreted with considerable caution for several reasons, including the relatively small (and non-randomly selected) number of sites at which the classroom observations took place and the fact that the observations were made at various discrete points of time within the total course and would thus not record activities taking place earlier or later in the course. On a very tentative basis, it may be suggested that the survey respondents, on the whole, may have somewhat overestimated the actual degree of use of these techniques, by comparison to the frequency with which they were noted by the on-site observers.

IN-SERVICE LANGUAGE TRAINING

A series of items in the survey questionnaire were addressed to the nature, scope, and perceived adequacy of the results of in-service language training activities at the responding centers. With respect to the overall parameters of this training, the great majority of centers (88%) indicated that there had been provisions for in-service training within the past three years. In most instances, in-service language instruction was optional (78%)

rather than mandatory (22%) (base N=37). Where the in-service training is optional, an average of 54% of the volunteers participate; the range of participation, however, is from 0-100% across the responding programs (N=32).

Reported total number of hours of in-service training ranged from 0-300 for first-year volunteers (average of 48 hours; base N=35), and from 0-270 hours for second-year volunteers (average 50 hours, N=25).

The most frequently reported instructional arrangement for in-service training was for the volunteers to "take language classes especially designed for in-service needs" (68%). Slightly less than half (49%) of the responding centers indicated that "there are no formal language classes for in-service volunteers, but they are encouraged to study the language on their own, obtain tutors, etc."

Further in-service training of volunteers through participation in regular pre-service language courses was appreciably less widespread (20% of the programs reporting). Written responses concerning "other" procedures for in-service language training generally reported various combinations of formal classwork and tutoring; one respondent reported that the training program included "language weekends" open to all volunteers, during which in-service volunteers could presumably practice and refine their language skills.

With regard to the established goals of in-service language training, almost 8 out of 10 respondents (79%) reported that no written goals were available to guide the in-service training process. None of the remaining 21% of sites stating that a written goal statement was available included or forwarded this statement as requested; written-in comments concerning in-service language goals were uniformly short and extremely general (for example, "improve [language] skills of interested volunteers"; "meet PCV needs"; "improve grammar and communication").

A generally divided response was obtained to the overall appraisal question, "Are you satisfied with current in-service language training?": 42% answered "yes" and 58%, "no." Suggested improvements in the in-service training included development of materials specific to job assignments and to the language dialects likely to be encountered by the volunteer, development of language materials better adapted to volunteers who have lived from some time in the country, the combining of in-service language training with job conferences, development of a "teaching cadre available year-round" to provide formalized in-service instruction, and provision for "better tutors and a better mechanism for teaching at the one-on-one level."

LANGUAGE-CLASS PLACEMENT AND COURSE-OF-TRAINING ASSESSMENT

In the questionnaire, a series of questions was posed concerning the manner in which newly-arriving trainees were initially assigned to language classes and the way or ways in which their developing achievements during the language training process were monitored and assessed. With respect to initial placement, the relevant questionnaire item read as follows: "On what basis are incoming students initially assigned to an appropriate language class? (Check all that apply.)" The response options provided, and the percentage of sites responding in each instance, are shown below:

Trainees are randomly or arbitrarily assigned to classes.	37%
Scores on FSI interviews administered prior to the trainee's arrival on-site.	12%
Scores on FSI interviews administered on-site prior to the beginning of the language program.	41%
A speaking interview other than the FSI.	39%
A role-playing situation.	7%
Information about previous language training on Peace Corps application forms.	37%
Scores on the Modern Language Aptitude Test (MLAT).	0%
Scores on a published language achievement test.	5%
Scores on a locally-prepared placement test.	5%
A self-appraisal of language proficiency by the trainee.	17%
Some other placement procedure (please describe).	37%

The relatively large percentage of centers indicating random or arbitrary initial assignment to classes would be anticipated in view of the fact that for uncommonly taught local languages, students would have no "testable" prior knowledge of the language. Also as anticipated, initial placement on the basis of FSI interview scores was widely reported; the relatively smaller number of sites reporting pre-arrival administration of the FSI interview (as opposed to on-site administration) is consistent with the current decentralized language training structure.

The 39% response rate for "a speaking interview other than the FSI" was somewhat surprising to project staff in that they were not aware of other recognized interviewing procedures that were being used on a widescale basis (nor were such other interviews identified in the course of the on-site visits). A probable explanation of this percentage figure is the use of an FSI-type interview by language teachers or other staff on-site who are not "certified" FSI testers, and whose interviewing activities would thus not be viewed by the respondent as an "(official) FSI interview." A fairly large number of responding centers (37%) reported use of data from the Peace Corps application form in connection with initial class placement.

Modern Language Aptitude Test (MLAT) scores were not used at any responding center for class placement, and only two centers (each) reported use of a published or locally-prepared test for this purpose. Language proficiency self-appraisals were used in 17% of the programs. "Other" reported procedures for assigning trainees to language classes included the holding of "free-form" language classes during the first two days of training, during which the instructors had the opportunity to observe the general proficiency level of the trainees and make placement decisions on this basis; random assignment of students during the first few days of classes, followed by division into proficiency groups (this procedure followed at four different centers); and placement based on impressions of oral proficiency obtained during informal teaching staff/trainee contacts prior to the beginning of classes. One program reported intentional grouping of older trainees with "the more experienced teachers."

As an indication of the degree of opportunity afforded trainees, once placed, to undergo appropriate placement changes based on classroom performance, the question was asked "Once assigned to a class, what flexibility is there for students to move to a more basic or more advanced class depending on their actual performance in the classroom? (Check one.)" About three-quarters (73%) of the responding centers indicated that this is "routinely done," and 25% reported "occasional" inter-class transfers. Only one site reported that such transfer "rarely, if ever, occurs."

Procedures used in assessing trainee progress in the course of instruction (presented on a "check all that apply" basis) involved primarily the observation of "general student performance during the class sessions" (reported by 88% of the responding training programs) but also--and with fairly high frequency--"periodically administered FSI interviews" (59%) or "a speaking interview other than the FSI" (59%) which, as discussed, may involve in large part an FSI-type interview administered by the teacher or other non-certified tester. Write-in comments concerning the frequency with which the FSI was administered generally indicated two or three administrations in the course of the training period; two centers reported FSI administration "every three weeks" and one, every two weeks. Frequency of administration of a "speaking interview other than the FSI" was generally even higher, with one site reporting its use "every two lessons" and another, "3-4 times per week." Role-playing situations were used for ongoing assessment purposes in about 4 out of 10 of the reporting centers (41%), with a generally similar frequency.

Textbook quizzes or other textbook-accompanying tests were used for progress monitoring in only about one-fifth of the reporting language programs (17%), as were "quizzes or other types of tests prepared by the individual instructors" (22%). Quizzes or tests prepared by the instructors on a group basis (and hence presumed to be more carefully developed and more in keeping with the instructional goals than the possibly somewhat idiosyncratic tests prepared by individual instructors) were reported by 27% of the responding centers.

"Other" progress testing techniques included the keeping of daily records of student performance (2 instances), "informal conversations with trainees" (2), trainee performance in carrying out "tasks in local markets, schools, etc. at the training site" (1), trainee teaching performance in the target language (1), oral presentations in front of the class (2), trainee self-assessments (1), and "check host family to see if PCT is utilizing language at home."

USE OF THE FSI INTERVIEW

Because of the great extent of current use of the FSI interview and its considerable programmatic significance both as a language assessment procedure and as a "reporting" criterion for language program evaluation, it was considered important to include in the questionnaire a series of questions concerning the way in which the FSI interview was administered and evaluated on-site, the number of qualified interviewers available to the program, diagnostic and feedback uses made of the interview results, and other related matters. Also important to determine were the opinions of "front-line" users of the FSI procedure concerning the extent to which they considered it a valid measure of the communication goals of their language program, including their observations on perceived deficiencies in the FSI testing process and their suggestions for improvements in this process and/or for alternative testing procedures.

The first question in this section asked for the number of "officially trained and currently certified FSI testers" that were available locally (defined as "either at the training site or within an hour or so of it"). The number of available certified testers ranged from 0-12 (7 centers reporting that they had no certified testers), with an average across centers of 3. With respect to the procedures used in administering the FSI on-site, respondents were asked to check one of 7 possible administration modes, as listed below with the associated percentage results (N=34):

(1) A single tester converses with the trainee and immediately assigns a score. The interview is not tape recorded. (41%)

(2) A single tester converses with the trainee and immediately assigns a score. The interview is tape recorded. (15%)

(3) A single tester converses with the trainee but does not assign a score. The interview is tape recorded and the recording is later evaluated to arrive at a score. (12%).

(4) Two testers are present during the interview and discuss and arrive at a score immediately following the interview. The interview is not tape recorded. (26%)

(5) Two testers are present during the interview and discuss and arrive at a score immediately following the interview. The interview is tape recorded. (0%)

(6) Two testers are present during the interview but do not assign a score. The interview is tape recorded and the recording is later evaluated to arrive at a score. (3%)

(7) Some other procedure is used for administering and scoring the interview. (3%)

There are several measurement implications of the different administration modes. First, two testers are needed in order to set up a role-play/translation situation, considered especially useful for checking language proficiency at both the lower and higher ends of the FSI scale. In only 29% of the reporting centers (total of modes 4 through 6) would this approach be possible.

In the most frequently reported administration mode (single tester, with no tape recording made of the interview), there is no means of double-checking the accuracy of the score assigned, nor of obtaining a permanent record of the interview for diagnosis, later comparative review of progress, or other purposes. In all of these instances (41% of the reporting programs), the only record of trainee performance is the single scoring notation made by a single tester and not subject to any external verification or further analysis.

Somewhat more desirable from the point of view of scoring reliability (and also permitting role-playing/translation) is mode (4)--two testers present, who discuss and agree on a rating, with no tape recording. This approach was reported by only 26% of the programs, and the even more desirable procedure of adding a permanent tape recording (mode 5) was not indicated in a single instance. On the strength of these data, it would appear that if the FSI interview (or a revised test based generally on the interview technique) is to serve as a major assessment procedure for Peace Corps language training, close attention to, and formal recommendations concerning, the specific administration mode to be used would be very much in order.

To the related administration question "Does the FSI interview as administered at your site routinely include a role-playing situation in which the student serves as an informal interpreter between the two testers?," 61% of the respondents noted that "this is rarely or never part of the interview," 25% that "this is used on certain occasions or with students at certain levels," and 14% that "this is always or almost always part of the interview procedure" (N=36).

In response to the question "What kind of feedback is given to the trainees concerning their performance on the FSI interview? (Check one.)," the following percentages were obtained:

(1) Only the FSI global score is given. (17%)

(2) Additional feedback on strengths and weaknesses of grammar, pronunciation, vocabulary, etc. is given if requested by the trainee. (14%)

(3) Feedback is given routinely as part of all interviews. (69%) (N=36)

On the basis of a related question, "In addition to the total (global) FSI scores, is any use made of the FSI "language factor" scores (i.e., separate ratings of Listening Comprehension, Pronunciation, Grammar, Vocabulary, and Fluency)?," the 32% "yes" response" would suggest that this type of diagnostic "sub-score" analysis of the overall FSI rating is at least in some cases part of the feedback information provided.

Three questions in the FSI interview section asked for the candid opinions of the respondents concerning the validity and usefulness of the FSI procedure as a measure of communicative proficiency within the specific framework of Peace Corps service. To the question, "In your opinion, do trainee scores on the FSI accurately reflect the trainee's ability to communicate in the target language effectively and appropriately in his or her job assignment?," 50% of the responding programs indicated "yes" and 50%, "no" (base N=36). Written responses in explanation of the negative judgments were concentrated in several areas. One criticism was that the FSI tests only the standard language and does not evaluate the trainee's ability to communicate with a local accent, using regional dialects, slang expressions, etc. The most frequent comments were that the FSI is too heavily directed toward grammatical accuracy and fails to reflect other important aspects of communication, including the ability to circumlocute or to "get the point across" using ungrammatical, albeit communicatively effective, means. Typical comments in this regard were: "Grammar plays too important a role and inhibits trainees from using the reserves of communicating skills they already have"; "Doesn't test ability to communicate: I have seen too many 1's who can talk rings around their fellows with 2's or 2+'s."

Several comments mentioned trainee anxiety in the rather formal interview setting as occasionally producing inaccurately low scores. A number of mentions were also made of suspected arbitrariness or unreliability on the part of the tester, for example: "Depends very much on who gives the test"; "results are occasionally inaccurate"; "testers tend to be too lenient and assign higher scores than are warranted."

A second "FSI opinion" question read as follows: "In the course of the training program (and/or as a result of the volunteer's in-field activities) do perceptible changes in level of communicative ability take place without being reflected in a changed FSI score?" Of 35 training programs responding to this question, 69% answered "yes" and 31%, "no." As with the preceding question, several of the written comments bore on the acquisition by the volunteer of local expressions, local and/or special work-related vocabulary, and/or increases in general fluency, all of which greatly enhanced communication in the field but did not raise the FSI level score. Characteristic comments in this regard included: "Vocabulary increases significantly and communication is effective but remaining static with regard to FSI score"; "vocabulary and comprehension increase rapidly, but grammar seems to 'hold back' FSI score."

Aspects of nonverbal communication, as well as communication-related personality factors not tapped by the FSI scale, were cited in several instances, including the following detailed comment: "Many become 'fluent,' but with severe grammar errors (often because of speaking errors of their counterparts), some build fairly extensive vocabularies, but again with construction/grammar errors. One of our best communicators had a 1+ in French because of grammar errors. However, at a dinner with a Frenchman and volunteer with an FSI 4, he came out on top in communicating. Non-verbal actions, basic personality greatly affect the success of language transmission. The equivalent FSI score is only one part."

To the final question in this section, "Does the FSI interview meet your testing needs?," the response was more evenly balanced: 46% "yes" and 54% "no" (N=35). Negative comments reiterated for the most part criticisms voiced in the two preceding questions. A variety of suggestions for changes in the testing procedure were given, including the recommendation to "[add] two supplements: 1) assessment of nonverbal skill--involving PST, IST, and PC program staff assessments, 2) objective written exam which requires specific feedback." The use of staff assessments in addition to the FSI score per se was echoed in a second comment that "a more subjective evaluation must be carried out by language staff in addition to the FSI. This evaluation must measure actual ability to communicate, using any means at hand." Two other comments urged "supplementing" the FSI interview but did not provide specific recommendations. Insensitivity of the FSI scale to modest but perceptible changes in proficiency was cited as a problem in one instance, with the recommendation that a "graduated" test should be developed that is "skill specific and more objective."

Observations made by Peace Corps in-country staff during the on-site visits with respect to the FSI interview were generally in keeping with the questionnaire-based comments. Except at two sites, where the respondents indicated overall satisfaction with the FSI interview as a suitable measure of the trainees' performance in the language, the general opinion was that the FSI technique, at least as it was being implemented on-site, was not fully adequate as an assessment device. Perceived shortcomings included some concern as to the reliability and consistency of the scores assigned by different interviewers (or by the same interviewer on different occasions); the overall duration of the interview (in some cases considered insufficient to fully assess the trainee's proficiency); the lack of knowledge/background of the interviewer in particular trainee service assignments (leading to insufficient probing of job-related language); and excessive emphasis, in the interview scoring, on grammatical accuracy rather than on communicative ability. Although the respondents did not offer specific recommendations for improving the interview process, they were in general agreement that the current FSI technique needed to be "modified" and/or "supplemented" to more fully meet their assessment needs.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROCEDURES FOR "SPECIAL" LEARNERS

A series of items in the survey questionnaire asked for a description of special language training courses (if any) that the program had developed for older trainees or for trainees with little academic background. Only 23% of the responding centers indicated that they had a special course for older trainees and 13% reported a specialized course for non-academically oriented trainees. Respondents who indicated that older-trainee and/or non-academic courses had been developed were asked to characterize them briefly. In general, the responses suggested that explicit distinctions were not being drawn between the two categories of learners, but that program modifications were made to cope with learning difficulties regardless of the presumed source(s) of the difficulties. The following comments are typical of this orientation: "We do modify the strict enforcement of Silent Way 'rules' for those people who are having difficulty with the methodology. While this often includes older trainees, it is by no means limited to them"; "We only divide [trainee] groups into 'learning speed' groups. Although this often separates older from younger trainees, it does NOT necessarily only separate age groups"; "Special assistance was provided for everyone depending upon the level of difficulty encountered. This was not done on the basis of age but on the basis of need."

For both the "older learner" and non-academic learner" questions, individual tutoring or individualized instruction were generally cited as the special training method used. One respondent indicated that the training procedure used with students of limited academic background "used more audiolingual method and more basic or elementary language structures"; another respondent cited individualized instruction "with more emphasis on writing/translation" as the procedure used with older trainees.

To the question "Are you satisfied with the language training for older trainees?," almost three out of four of the responding sites answered "no" (74%, base N=35). Written comments typically stressed negative results attributable to the learners themselves and/or the inability of the program to provide adequately tailored instruction: "They are still placed in an unfair competitive position with younger trainees"; "our success rate in getting older trainees to a fluency level has not been high"; "success rate is poor, despite often heroic efforts on both sides"; "we do not think we have the answer to what is best for older trainees. An in-depth study must be done"; "Effective communicative competence exercises which would facilitate the older trainee's internalization of structure and vocabulary is still a weak area in our program." One respondent suggested that older trainees should receive stateside language training before arriving in-country.

To the question "Are you satisfied with the language training program for trainees with little academic background?," the response percentages were, somewhat surprisingly, reversed, with 65% responding affirmatively (base N=31). Analysis of the written comments suggested that a number of the responding centers may have been "satisfied" with their situation in the sense that they had few or no non-academic trainees in their program and thus required no program modifications. Four respondents marked this question "not applicable," and three others indicated that there had been "too few" non-academic students to permit a judgment or that they had no students of this type in the program. In the same regard, one center reported that "we have no particular approach aside from commiseration and slow pacing but we only receive one or two a year which doesn't make it worth our time to invest in detailing a program." Another comment was that "I have never had trainees with little academic background, but my guess is that they are left out just like the older trainees. Guidelines for appropriate syllabus and methodologies need to be devised/developed for these groups of trainees."

In-field discussions with directors and coordinators at the several sites visited, as well as classroom observations, indicated that very few older learners were in fact undergoing language training. At one site, a trainee of "about 40" was participating in the regular classroom program, with no special methodology. "No special methodology" for older trainees was indicated at two other sites. Tutorial sessions in addition to the regular classroom work were being provided in one program, and up to two more weeks of additional instruction at another. With regard to the teaching approaches being used with older learners, "more visuals" and slower pacing were being used at one site; at another, the learning expectations themselves were lowered, with the instructor concentrating on only the "past, present, and future" tenses.

CONTACTS WITH AND ASSISTANCE FROM PEACE CORPS/WASHINGTON

The types of assistance requested from Peace Corps/Washington on matters related to language training were sought by the question, "Do you communicate with Peace Corps/Washington about any of the following? (Check "Yes" or "No" for each statement below.)" The items listed and the percentage of "yes" responses across centers are shown below:

Assistance or information about how to develop language training programs. (30%) (N=37)

Assistance or information about problems that may occur in the language training program. (30%) (N=37)

Requests for potentially more appropriate training materials. (51%)

Requests for potentially more appropriate testing and assessment techniques. (36%)

Recommendations for teacher training practices, teacher training, or teacher evaluation techniques. (32%) (N=37)

Information concerning language training activities at other Peace Corps sites. (45%)

Information concerning training in the same language at different Peace Corps sites. (33%) (N=36)

Requests for language coordinator. (32%)

Requests for other language consultants. (42%)

Written comments concerning other requested information or assistance included one mention of "techniques for older learners," one request for "latest and modern technique in teaching second language," and one indication that "we [requested] FSI tester training and certification, so far no success." One site indicated that "[country] has not received any significant assistance from PC/W in the recent years," and one smugly observed that "PC/W usually asks us for this kind of info." One center stated that "we tend to work more closely with RTRO (Regional Training and Resource Office) than with PC/W," and similar comments were made by three other sites.

To the summary question, "Are you satisfied with Peace Corps/Washington support?," 68% of the responding centers answered "yes" and 32%, "no." Of the negative responses, written comments indicated in some cases a lack of knowledge of what support Peace Corps/Washington might be able to offer and/or what the quality of this support would be: "We don't know what support they offer"; "not familiar at this point [with] what and of what caliber D.C. can really support us other than in budgetary matters." Several comments were again made emphasizing the working relationships estabished with RTRO ("We generally go to RTRO if we need help") and suggesting that budgetary support by PC/W was the most important aspect of Washington assistance. Relevant comments here included: "More money to support RTRO and regional language and cross-cultural teachers' workshops"; We don't turn to Washington often for language problems. RTRO seems more appropriate. We are satisfied with RTRO's support and wish to see it continue. They are doing a good job. As for PC/W, if they give us a sufficient training budget, that is plenty."

Across most of the training programs visited on-site, there was little reported contact or interaction between the language training program and Peace Corps/Washington. One respondent described communications between the language program and PC/W as "non-existent"; another stated that contact had been attempted on a few occasions (to request consultants and language-related materials) but without results. Several Africa region sites indicated that their major source of language training information and support was through RTRO rather than Peace Corps/Washington; they routinely praised the assistance provided by RTRO.

GENERAL OPINIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The final section of the questionnaire was intended to give the respondents the opportunity to comment more extensively on any aspects of their language training program that they did not feel had been adequately covered in the preceding sections, to make recommendations concerning ways in which Peace Corps/Washington could better support the in-country language training programs, and to indicate what particular aspects of the language program at their own site were currently most in need of development.

To the question, "Is there anything about language training programs that we have not discussed in the questionnaire which you feel is important and should be taken into consideration?" two sites reported that they considered the questionnaire "comprehensive" and did not have any additional suggestions. The other comments to this question broached a number of different topics, with little discernible patterning. Topics raised by individual respondents included: pre-service pre-training, the counseling/support function of language instructors vis-a-vis the trainees, ways of dealing with trainees who arrive in-country without being part of a regular training group, "dramatic differences" in FSI scores across countries, techniques for teaching advanced and semi-advanced students, coping with teacher turnover, and several others. Two mentions were made of the role of RTRO (Africa region), procedures for dealing with older and non-academically oriented trainees, and cross-cultural training.

Written comments to the second question in this section ("Are there any special conditions or circumstances that either facilitate or impede effective language/communication training at this site?") were again quite varied; the following are representative of their general nature and tenor:

- Difficulty in finding qualified instructors for five local languages
- Poor teaching materials oriented toward academic rather than practical command of the language
- "[language teachers] should have private or semi-private rooms"
- Only one month lead-time to mount entirely new language training program
- Non-command of English by host country teachers makes implementation of community language-learning techniques difficult

- Problems in teaching Peace Corps language in a university setting while university classes are in session
- (cited as a positive influence) trainees living in village with assigned families throughout training
- (positive) "stable group of trainers doing training essentially year-round at a permanent site."

Responses to the final question--"What specific aspects of your language training program would you like to improve (e.g., teacher training, teacher selection, language materials, methodology)?"--were generally straightforward and surprisingly uniform within several major categories. The single most frequently mentioned area of needed improvement was teacher training (reported by 11 programs), followed quite closely by methodology and instructional materials (9 instances each). Procedures for teacher selection were mentioned in 4 instances as an area of needed development; the need for improved language testing procedures was noted twice, as was the need to obtain a full-time language coordinator for the program.

At two of the language programs visited on-site, the hope was expressed that PC/W could develop a better process for pre-selecting trainees, including both language-related trainee characteristics and general background/personality factors. For the former, it was suggested that trainee candidates who could reasonably be expected to experience language learning difficulties be given specially designed language training at a stateside location before being sent to the training site.

Other "messages for Washington" given by individual PC directors or coordinators, and that the project observers promised to relay, included: satisfaction with the decision to move away from regional training centers (from an LAC site; appreciation and respect for work at and by RTRO (2 Africa sites); and requests for more frequent and detailed communication between PC/W and the training sites, including a greater amount of information on current language training materials and methodology (several sites.)

II. COMPARISON AND ANALYSIS

In this section, a number of aspects of current language training in the Peace Corps, as determined through the survey questionnaire data and site visit information described in the preceding section, are compared to and analysed in terms of recent theoretical and/or research-based developments in these areas, with relevant implications being drawn for possible improvements in Peace Corps practices in these areas. The question of appropriate teaching methodologies and associated teacher training and materials considerations is discussed first, followed by an analysis of proficiency and achievement testing procedures that would be considered most responsive to Peace Corps needs in determining the overall communicative competence of trainees and volunteers.

The last four parts of this section address, respectively, the questions of "methodology match to language," instructional procedures appropriate for older learners and learners with non-academic backgrounds, the "communicative relevance" of Peace Corps language instruction in developing functionally-oriented communicative proficiency, and a number of structural considerations that bear on the effectiveness and overall success of the language training program.

METHODOLOGY; TEACHER TRAINING, AND MATERIALS IMPLICATIONS

Within the Peace Corps context, a well as in virtually all other areas of "real-life" language instruction, it is for all practical purposes impossible to conduct adequate and meaningful experimentally-based studies of language teaching methodologies. Difficulties encountered in such an effort include, as a major factor, the problem of allocating students to the different experimental treatments (i.e., different methodologies) in a way that effectively balances out performance factors attributable to differences in student characteristics (such as degree of interest in, motivation and aptitude for language learning, extent of prior exposure to and control of the language) and numerous other learner-specific variables that are known or can reasonably be assumed to influence the nature and rate of language acquisition. Strict random assignment of students to methodology is the procedure of choice in this regard, but cannot be implemented in most instructional settings.

In situations where random allocation of students is not possible, adequate statistical "control" of the effects of student-related variables through covariance analysis or other techniques is possible in theory but is generally very difficult in practice, due to the need to obtain, for each student, his or her "scores" on actual measures of "language aptitude, "motivation," "prior language achievement," etc. that are intended to be used as the control variables. Even if this detailed data gathering can be accomplished and made use of in the methodological study, it is always possible for critical reviewers of the results to suggest that the true source of observed differences in student performance across the methods under comparison does not lie in differing relative efficiencies of the methods, but in one or more other methodology-independent variables that were not accounted for in the "statistical control" approach.

A second problem in the direct experimental comparison of methods is that of insuring that the different methods are kept "pure" throughout the course of the study, in the sense that the teachers ostensibly following a given methodology do in fact adhere closely to the basic tenets of that methodology in the course of the instruction. The considerable difficulties encountered in maintaining the methodological purity of each of the instructional approaches under comparison in an experimentally-based study are exemplified in the well-known "Pennsylvania study" comparing the effectiveness of audio-lingual and cognitive-code methodologies (Smith, 1970), a research effort for which one of the major criticisms was the inability, under actual operating conditions, of maintaining adequate separation of the two approaches during the classroom instruction.

A third problem associated with direct experimental comparison of methods is that of establishing the appropriateness and validity of the criterion performance measure, that is, the proficiency test or other measurement procedure that is used to evaluate the degree of "success" of the methodologies under study. To the extent that the criterion measure does not closely reflect the intended behavioral outcomes of the instruction (independently of method), it may properly be considered an inappropriate and potentially misleading standard against which to judge the relative merits of the methodologies being compared. Within the Peace Corps framework, for example, use of the FSI interview scores as the major or sole criterion of instructional quality for different methodologies could produce misleading results to the extent that the FSI scores reflected student performance attributes not closely or directly indicative of the instructional outcomes being sought (for example, extent of vocabulary and accuracy of grammatical control *per se*, as distinguished from overall communicative performance).

In view of these and numerous other conceptual and procedural difficulties associated with the direct experimental comparison of methodologies outside of highly controlled "laboratory" situations, it would be considered inappropriate and generally unproductive for the Peace Corps to attempt to undertake such studies in connection with its consideration of various proposed teaching methodologies. A more suitable approach, and the approach which has been followed for this report, involves the logical, qualitative analysis of several possible methodologies from the viewpoint of fundamental aspects of each methodology, including (1) the instructional outcomes (i.e., student learning goals) envisioned by the methodology and the extent of their congruence with Peace Corps language teaching goals; (2) the teaching techniques employed and their ease of implementation in typical Peace Corps settings; (3) classroom requirements and other physical arrangements that are dictated by the method; (4) implications of the method for teacher selection and training, (5) textbook and/or other materials requirements; (6) types of students for whom the method would be considered appropriate; and (7) other considerations involved in the use of the method, including its relative applicability to different types of languages. By considering each of these aspects in light of the Peace Corps language training requirements, capabilities, and practical restrictions as these have been identified in the project survey, it is possible to arrive at an indication of the advantages and drawbacks, for Peace Corps applications, of each method from each of these standpoints.

Following this analysis, a brief description is given of some important recent developments in the design of instructional syllabuses (especially for learning situations in which it is possible to closely specify the real-life settings in which the language will be used), as well as of some current research findings that have direct implications for the selection of appropriate teaching approaches. Finally, on the basis of all the preceding discussions, suggestions will be made concerning a general methodological orientation to Peace Corps language teaching that could be expected to enhance its effectiveness within the practical constraints involved in in-field language instruction.

In the pages below, a total of eight generally recognized methodologies of foreign language instruction, all of which were reported and/or observed as being used to at least some extent in Peace Corps language teaching, are briefly characterized and discussed from the perspectives outlined.

Grammar-Translation Method (References: Kelley, 1969; Chastain, 1976)

Instructional goals. The basic goal of the grammar-translation method is the development of reading and writing skills in the target language, with reading ability subsequently becoming the vehicle through which the literature and formal culture (history, fine arts, etc.) of the target language country are learned by studying original texts on these subjects.

Teaching techniques. Classes are taught primarily in the student's native language and include the presentation of explicit grammatical rules to be learned and applied by the students. Vocabulary lists showing target/native language "equivalents" are provided to be memorized. There is little spoken use of the target language in class; instead, students are given information and rules concerning the phonology of the language, with discussion in English. The teacher plays an authoritarian role and most of the classroom interaction is between teacher and student (little student-to-student interaction).

Classroom and equipment requirements. There are no special requirements in this regard; classroom is arranged in a traditional style (student chairs in rows, instructor at the front of the room).

Teacher background and training. The teacher does not need to be a native speaker of the target language but needs a solid foundation in linguistics and a conscious knowledge of the rules and terminology of the language being taught. Should speak the student's *native* language well in order to adequately explain structural rules, etc. by this means. The Peace Corps situation with respect to instructors is the reverse of that implied by the grammar-translation method in that the great majority of Peace Corps instructors (93%) are host-country native speakers of the target language, whose proficiency in English would probably not be sufficient for giving the necessary grammatical explanations in that language.

Texbook, other materials requirements. A textbook is used, containing reading passages excerpted from the target language literature, descriptive passages about the target language culture, translation exercises, vocabulary lists with native language equivalents, and grammar rules and verb paradigms. For Peace Corps applications, textbooks of this type would not generally be available except for French and Spanish, and their cultural content would be based primarily on "metropolitan Europe" formal culture and civilization of little relevance to Peace Corps in-country situations.

Types of students. There would be no obvious restrictions in this regard. For older trainees who have previously studied the language in school, this would probably be a familiar and "comfortable" technique.

Other considerations. This approach would not be feasible for local languages which do not have an extensive "literature" of the type envisioned by this method.

Audiolingual Method (References: Rivers, 1964; Chastain and Woerdehoff, 1968)

Instructional goals. Instructional goals of the audiolingual method are aimed at communicative competence in the general sense of accurate and effective conversation with native speakers. Structural correctness and precision of vocabulary are considered important attributes of this competence and are deliberately trained for in the instruction. Considerable emphasis is placed on accurate, "native-like" pronunciation. Audiolingual goals, in their "official" expression, are not incompatible with Peace Corps language goals, although the emphasis on grammatical and phonological accuracy may be somewhat tangential to development of basic communicative facility *per se*.

Teaching techniques. New material is presented in dialogue form, which is then learned through intensive memorization and repetition. A variety of structural drills based on the dialogue are used to train automatic, structurally correct responses on the part of the student; in this activity, form may be emphasized over meaning. Introduction of new vocabulary is strictly limited and is always presented in context. Grammar rules are inferred inductively and no explicit rules are given. Successful responses on the part of the student are immediately reinforced by the teacher, and the learning process is conducted so as to prevent student errors to the greatest extent possible. Listening and speaking are emphasized over reading and writing, the latter being introduced at a somewhat later time and based on material already presented orally. Cultural information is conveyed through the situations and actions represented in the dialogues or, on occasion, through direct explanation. The target language is used almost exclusively in the classroom, with only occasional recourse to the student's native language. The instructor serves as an "orchestra leader" of pattern practice drills and other activities and remains in strong control of the class at all times.

Classroom and equipment requirements. Small classes are required for effective dialogue presentation and drill work, and a language laboratory is an important adjunct for additional listening and speaking practice. Since in the questionnaire survey, language laboratory facilities are reported as "available on-site" for only 3% of the responding training programs, this basic additional practice would not be an option in virtually all instances.

Teacher background and training. Teachers should have native fluency and native or near-native accent in order to serve as appropriate pronunciation models. Specific training in audiolingual methodology is needed, with considerable practice in presenting dialogues, conducting effective drill practice, etc. The teacher is extremely active during the class and needs considerable stamina.

Textbook, other materials requirements. Very carefully planned dialogues and other drills must be presented in a textbook and/or prepared by the teacher.

Types of students. Visually-oriented students accustomed to referring to printed materials during study may be somewhat hampered by the audiolingual approach, at least initially. By the same token, students with limited aural memory may have difficulty learning the dialogues and participating adequately in drill sessions.

Other considerations. Development of audiolingual materials is based on a contrastive analysis approach, so that problem areas in one language (and on which specific exercises are prepared) may not be reflected in other languages. Specifically designed and individually developed training materials are therefore needed for each native language/target language combination. For target languages that are relatively free in syntax, the "pattern practice" approach may be less applicable and therefore less effective.

Suggestopedia (References: Racle, 1976; Bushman and Madsen, 1976; Lozanov, 1978)

Instructional goals. Teaching goals aim at communicative competence in a generalized sense. Although lexical and grammatical accuracy are desirable outcomes, the basic focus is on easy and psychologically appropriate interaction with other speakers of the language, rather than on linguistic accuracy.

Teaching techniques. The typical procedure is for large amounts of new material (up to 20 pages) to be presented in the form of a dialogue which the teacher reads, with varying delivery styles and emphases, to the accompaniment of soft music, preferable baroque. Students subsequently study and are drilled on the dialogue; role-playing in which students act out sections of the dialogue is also frequently used. Vocabulary growth is emphasized throughout, with large numbers of new lexical items introduced in context. The teacher uses dramatic techniques to make meanings clear, and often introduces games and songs to lighten the learning atmosphere. All four skills are worked on simultaneously. To help reduce student anxiety and inhibitions, students are assigned pseudonyms and are given "new personalities" and professions which they adopt for purposes of the classroom exercises.

Classroom and equipment requirements. Great emphasis is placed on comfortable, relaxed surroundings for language learning, including "easy" chairs, soft lighting, and background music. Of all the methodologies under discussion, the suggestopedic approach is the most demanding with respect to the physical arrangements prescribed. The quiet and restful environment that is envisioned by the developers of this method (and considered highly important to its pedagogical success) would not realistically be available at a number of operational Peace Corps sites (see discussion under "Language Training Program Funding, Facilities, and Supplies" in preceding section). By the same token, the use of soft music as a training aid would in all probability not be a viable possibility within the general ambience of the training site.

Teacher background and training. A considerable amount of training and practice in the method is required, and the instructor's role as a "benevolent authority" in whom the students must come to place their total trust may not be compatible with the individual personality or previously developed teaching approaches of particular instructors. Since approximately four out of ten (39%) of the current Peace Corps instructors are reported as having previous experience teaching the target language outside of the Peace Corps (which experience would in all probability not have involved the suggestopedic method), the likelihood of conceptual/procedural conflicts between the suggestopedic approach and previously practiced methodologies would be fairly great. (By the same token, a shift within the local Peace Corps program from some other methodology to the suggestopedic approach could be expected to have the same general result).

Textbook, other materials requirements. Textbooks are not required, but lengthy dialogues in the target language must be prepared, together with printed vocabulary glosses and applicable grammar rules given in the native language. Teachers who have little or no technical training in English would proababely not be able to handle the explicative tasks involved.

Types of students. This technique is considered generally applicable for all types of students involved in Peace Corps training (although it would not be appropriate for young children). Proponents of the suggestopedic approach contend that languages can be well learned by anyone, provided that negative suggestions and feelings about the learning process can be overcome. The written-out dialogues with glosses and explanations may be helpful to students who prefer to make use of visually-presented information.

Other considerations. A shared orthographic system between native and target language would be virtually required to permit effective preparation of the printed dialogues and glosses. Otherwise, distracting and potentially confusing transliteration would have to be used.

Total Physical Response (References: Kunihara and Asher, 1965; Asher, 1969; Asher, 1977)

Instructional goals. The Total Physical Response method is aimed at developing general communicative ability in the target language and would be compatible with Peace Corps objectives in this regard.

Teaching techniques. A major tenet of the TPR method is that (as in first language learning) listening comprehension should precede speaking, and that students should begin to speak only when they are "ready" to do so. The teacher issues spoken commands in the target language (e.g., "stand up," "sit down," walk to the door," etc.) which are first modeled by the teacher and then acted out by the students. As comprehension increases, the commands may be "chained," with several sequential actions being requested. Speaking practice begins when students express an interest in doing so; this consists of action commands given, by the student, to the teacher or other members of the class. Student errors are corrected selectively, with the teacher allowing wide tolerance initially (to encourage speech), and later "fine tuning" the students' responses. Reading comprehension and written production are subordinated to listening/speaking and involve the reading and writing out of the most recently practiced commands. Commands are often "zany," and an attempt is made to produce humorous actions or action sequences. Most of the class is conducted in the target language.

Classroom and equipment requirements. The TPR approach has no special classroom requirements, except for adequate space to carry out the actions demanded.

Teacher background and training. By comparison to other techniques (e.g., audiolingual method), TPR requires relatively little expertise to initiate the beginning steps of the instruction. However, more sophistication and imagination are needed to successfully incorporate other language aspects (different verb tenses, non-concrete lexicon) into the imperative framework. Dramatic flair is an asset, and less outgoing teachers may not be as comfortable with the procedure.

Textbook, other materials requirements. No textbook is required, but a variety of props, pictures, and other realia are needed for use in conjunction with the commands (e.g., "give the hat to Mary and the ruler to Bill").

Types of students. Students having an orientation toward the use of printed materials rather than auditory learning may be at a disadvantage, and some students may be reluctant to participate in what they perceive as "zany" classroom activities.

Other considerations. There is currently some controversy over the extent to which "higher-level" communication involving the use of figurative or non-concrete language can be effectively trained through the medium of imperative constructions.

Counseling-Learning/Community Language Learning (References: LaForge, 1971; Curran, 1976; Brown, 1977)

Instructional goals. CL/CLL is directed toward the development of communicative competence in listening comprehension and speaking. Reading and writing is not stressed for skill development in these areas per se, but students have incidental exposure to both skills in the course of classroom work.

Teaching techniques. Teaching techniques in the CL/CLL method are fairly complex and differ appreciably from those of the audiolingual, direct method, and other more "common" approaches. Instruction begins with students facing one another in a circle, with the teacher on the outside of the circle. When a student wishes to say something, he or she signals to the teacher, who walks over to the learner and quietly speaks the target language equivalent of the native language sentence. The student then repeats aloud the target language utterance, which is recorded by a tape recorder in the center of the circle. Other students enter into this activity when and to the extent they wish to do so. At first, students' utterances may be perfunctory and idiosyncratic, but group conversation generally ensues, on topics of interest to the students. After a certain period of asking target language equivalents from the instructor, students voluntarily begin to construct their own target language utterances. Toward the end of the class period, the tape recording is played back for review and a written transcript prepared. This transcript is commented on by both students and teacher in an attempt to infer structural principles involved. Students are also encouraged to make observations on the language learning process and on their personal reactions to the process.

As the class progresses, the students become more independent in their use of the language and may even resent the teacher's assistance as they practice their developing skill. At the highest level of accomplishment, students begin to interact with the instructor as co-equals in the conversation. throughout the instruction, the teacher's role is that of informant and facilitator rather than "leader" of the learning process.

Classroom and equipment requirements. Circular seating is very important; other arrangements (e.g., fixed chairs or benches) hamper the process considerably. A tape recorder is needed to record and review utterances generated during the class. The method is fairly sensitive to classroom noises and other disturbances, since considerable concentration is required and the instructor's voice in speaking the target language equivalents is deliberately kept low. No textbook is used, but printed transcripts of the conversation are prepared and distributed.

Teacher background and training. Because of the "simultaneous translator" role played by the instructor, he or she must be highly proficient in both the target language and in the native language of the students. Extensive preliminary training in the method is necessary in view of its substantial departure from more conventional techniques. Depending on their own personalities and teaching styles, some experienced instructors may not feel comfortable in the "counseling" (rather than "active teaching") role which this method requires.

Textbook, other materials requirements. No textbook is used, but printed transcripts of the conversation are prepared and distributed.

Types of students. Students who have previously studied the language (or some other language) by means of a different technique may be somewhat suspicious and unreceptive of the highly novel procedure involved and may attempt to carry out conventional textbook study "on the side." Depending on personality factors, students may show varying degrees of willingness to participate in the group-directed speaking activity. Students having a low tolerance for ambiguity may find the procedure at least initially frustrating.

Other considerations. If the native and target languages do not share the same orthographic system, transliteration will be required for the conversation transcripts. The psychological relationships between the "counselor" teacher and the learners are more complex and "sensitive" than in other approaches, and the tone and manner adopted by the instructor in his or her role is closely related to the effectiveness of the teacher-student interaction.

Direct Method (References: Rivers, 1964; Chastain, 1976)

Instructional goals. Instructional goals include the development of a high level of listening/speaking proficiency (including accurate pronunciation) in realistic language-use situations, as well as simultaneous skills development in reading and writing. Students are intended to come to "think in the language" as quickly as possible.

Teaching techniques. The target language is used exclusively (absolute prohibition on use of the native language). Lessons typically involve presentation and practice of situationally-based dialogues (at the bank, shopping at the market, etc.). In addition, there is an appreciable amount of "free conversation" practice. All four skills are worked on from the beginning. There is considerable use of realia and actions in a situational context, to introduce vocabulary as well as grammatical and cultural points. Grammar is learned inductively, with students inferring rules on the basis of examples provided by the instructor.

Classroom and equipment requirements. There are no special requirements in this regard.

Teacher background and training. Native-speaker fluency and native-like pronunciation in the target language are required, but the teacher does not need to speak the student's language (and indeed, may have a pedagogical advantage in this regard). The teacher must be creative in order to convey new information to students exclusively in the target language.

Textbook, other materials requirements. Textbooks are not required with the direct method, but they may be used.

Types of students. No obvious restrictions in this respect.

Other considerations. Although written forms are usually introduced early on, the method would "work" in situations where introduction of the writing system is delayed or eliminated, as well as with languages which do not have a writing system.

Silent Way (References: Gattegno, 1972; Gattegno, 1976; Stevick, 1980)

Instructional goals. General communicative competence, with some latitude for structural/lexical insufficiencies, provided that the intended message is conveyed. Reading and writing are incorporated as supplements and aids in the development of listening/speaking ability.

Teaching techniques. Printed, color-coded sound/symbol ("Fidel") charts are used from the beginning to introduce and train students in the pronunciation of words being used in the class. Accuracy of pronunciation is stressed. The second basic instructional process involves use of small colored rods (cuisenaire rods) that are set up and manipulated in various ways to provide a speaking stimulus. These rods can represent a great variety of items (e.g., imaginary buildings, people, etc.) and are used very flexibly and imaginatively. There is little or no use of the native language. Reading and writing are practiced by having students make written transcripts of material initially presented orally. Vocabulary is strictly controlled while linguistic patterns are being worked on. The instructor speaks relatively little during the class, and attempts to set up situations which will prompt students to generate statements. Naturally occurring silent periods during class are seen as advantageous, since they allow students time to reflect and inductively learn the material being worked on. A few minutes are often reserved at the end of the class for teacher/student discussion of the learning process itself, and reflections on what has been learned during the class.

Classroom and equipment requirements. Small classes are preferable, with students seated in a circle or (desirably) around a table, on which the cuisenaire rods are placed. Fidel charts, rods, and in some cases, books or other printed materials are used. A quiet, comfortable environment is needed to promote close attention and reflection on the students' part.

Teacher background and training. Extensive training is required to fully exploit this method. Because of the considerable departure from more traditional teaching techniques, teachers who are accustomed to playing a more active instructional role (e.g., in audiolingual or direct methods) may have some difficulty in understanding and properly following the technique.

Textbook, other materials requirements. Cuisenaire rods and Fidel charts are needed. The latter are already available for a number of Peace Corps languages, and could be fairly readily prepared for other languages in which they are not now available.

Types of students. Students who are flexible and tolerant of ambuguity would be expected to adapt more readily to this approach than would students with a more rigid learning style or with fixed expectations of how a language class "should" be conducted.

Other considerations. The method is applicable to languages with character-based or other non-Roman writing systems.

Cognitive-Code (References: Chastain and Woerdehoff, 1968; Chastain, 1970; Chastain, 1976)

Instructional goals. Development of all four language skills is stressed, except that comprehension is intended to precede production.

Teaching techniques. Use of the native language is permitted to explain grammar points and carry out other aspects of instruction. Students are expected to understand the material they are working on (through a deductive process) before they practice it orally; and rote drilling is avoided. Vocabulary acquisition is stressed. Students are encouraged to be creative with the language, and communication games and problem-solving tasks are frequently employed. Student-to-student interaction is frequent.

Classroom and equipment requirements. There are no special classroom arrangement or equipment requirements.

Teacher background and training. The teacher need not be a native speaker of the target language but must have a conscious knowledge of the structure of the language and be able to analyze and explain it to the students. The teacher's role is largely authoritarian; teachers who have worked in "traditional" instructional settings would be expected to be familiar and comfortable with the basic procedures of this methodology.

Textbook, other materials requirements. A textbook is generally used.

Types of students. Should be appropriate for learners other than young children who have not developed abstract thinking capacities. Persons in occupations requiring a high level of analytic thinking (e.g., doctors, engineers) should find this approach very compatible.

The paragraphs below summarize the preceding discussion of the individual methods under each of the criteria used in the analysis.

Adherence to Peace Corps Language Goals

Response to the survey questions concerning established language learning goals, as well as contacts with directors and language-training staff on-site, indicated quite strongly (as would have been anticipated) that the development of communicatively adequate speaking ability and the associated listening comprehension facility were the primary objectives insofar as development of the defferent language skills is concerned, with reading comprehension and writing skills being of supplementary value for some applications (for example, understanding government circulars printed in the target language; writing request letters to local authorities). Given this basic orientation with respect to program goals, the grammar-translation approach, which emphasizes primarily reading comprehension, can be ruled out of further consideration as not responsive to the intended outcomes of Peace Corps language training. The grammar-translation approach, as previously discussed, also requires the teacher to have a high level of command of the student's native language (i.e., English), a situation that would probably not be the case in many instances insofar as the Peace Corps instructors are concerned. The remaining methodologies all undertake to develop speaking proficiency as a major (if not, in some cases, exclusive) goal.

Teaching Techniques

The total physical response approach has been questioned with respect to the extent to which it can be used to teach all of the relevant language material needed to reach a functional level of communication ability. Thus, there is some question of whether the TPR technique can constitutue a "complete" method of instruction, up to the levels of language proficiency required for effective in-field services.

Classroom and Equipment Requirements

With regard to classroom and equipment requirements, the counseling-learning, Silent Way, and suggestopedic approaches (especially the latter) require quiet, concentration-enhancing learning environments that may be difficult to obtain at many training sites. Although this would probably not be sufficient to rule out completely the use of one of another of these methods, it may be considered a negative factor that should be weighed in conjunction with other aspects. Audiolingual, total physical response, direct method, and cognitive code methods have no special requirements in this regard.

Teacher Background and Training Implications

Of the methodology under discussion, suggestopedia, counseling-learning, and Silent Way all require a very high level of training on the instructor's part, as well as a psychological orientation to the teaching task that may be quite "foreign" to the instructor's usual mode of classroom operation. In addition, the counseling-learning procedure involves a considerable amount of "instantaneous translation" on the instructor's part, requiring a high level of familiarity with the student's native language as well as with the target language. Many current or prospective Peace Corps language instructors may not have the requisite proficiency in English to properly carry out this aspect of counseling-learning instruction.

The audiolingual, total physical response, direct method, and cognitive-code procedures all appear to represent feasible procedures from the view-points of teacher background and training. Of the four, the audiolingual method is probably most demanding in terms of the training effort that would be required for adequate performance.

Textbook and Materials Implications

Suggestopedic, counseling-learning, and Silent Way methodologies do not make use of regular textbooks as such, but do involve preparation of transcripts or other written materials in the target language. Except for the effort required to develop these materials, no pedagogical difficulties would be involved except in the case of target languages having non-Roman orthographies, for which it would be necessary to teach explicitly the target language orthography as a precondition to working with the written material.

Although textbooks/or other printed materials are in theory not required for either audiolingul or cognitive-code approaches, if such materials are used, they may be specifically designed for use with these methods.

Types of Students

It would be impossible in practice to fully accommodate differences in learning styles on the part of individual trainees within the scope of a single method, so methodological decisions in this regard would presumably look toward identifying a methodology or methodologies that most trainees would find straightforward and "comfortable." The audiolingual, direct method, and cognitive-code approaches would be considered most compatible with student expectations and prior learning experiences, while the suggestopedic, counseling-learning, total physical response, and Silent Way methodologies could be expected to vary more widely in degree of acceptance.

Summary

On the basis of the preceding comparisons, it would appear that the suggestopedic, Silent Way, and counseling-learning approaches present the greatest practical problems with regard to teacher background and training requirements. The total physical response technique is viewed as limited in scope, although potentially applicable as an adjunct technique.

The direct method cognitive-code, and audiolingual approaches would not be ruled out according to the criteria so far examined. However, in light of recent work in curriculum development for second language instruction and research studies on second language acquisition, a somewhat more extended discussion is required to relate these methodologies as closely as possible to the intended functional communcation goals of Peace Corps language instruction.

Implications of Recent Work in Curriculum Development

The oldest and most well-known approach to defining course content and developing associated methodologies and materials is the so-called "structural" approach (cf. Alexander, 1976), in with the course developer focuses on the grammatical structures of the target language and attempts to sequence them in the pedagogically most efficient way. Wilkins (1976) lists four criteria for this type of sequencing:

(1) simplicity (teach the simplest structures first);
(2) regularity (teach the most generalizable and productive items first);
(3) frequency (teach the most commonly used items first);
(4) contrastive difficulty (emphasize those structures that cause problems due to first language interference).

These criteria often lead to conflicts, in that, for example, the most common structures in real-life use of the language are often complex and irregular. More importantly for teaching materials preparation, to the extent that the materials author concentrates attention on presenting certain structures in a specified order, insufficient care may be paid to insuring that these structures are embodied in realistic language-use contexts.

A second approach to developing course content is the "situational" approach, in which the intent is to focus on language as a social communication medium. Under this procedure, the selection of items to be taught is based on the particular real-life settings in which the learner is most apt to make use of the language. A major problem with the situational approach is that it does not automatically specify the types of structures that will be used in a given situation: two people who are "at the post office" can (and do) talk about a wide variety of topics, using a wide range of structures. Although the identification of specific situations in which oral interaction is expected to take place is a first step in the development of a communicatively-oriented course, it is not a sufficient condition for this development.

A third, and only fairly recently-elaborated procedure for specifying course content is the so-called "functional-notional" approach, which derives in large part from work conducted in the early 1970's under the auspices of the Council for Cultural Cooperation of the Council of Europe (Van Ek, 1975). The basic aim of the functional-notional approach is to teach the student to express different types of "functions" (e.g., agreeing, disagreeing, expressing uncertainty, expressing enthusiasm) within each of a variety of "notional" areas (quantity, amount, cause, location, etc.) A major theoretical and practical drawback in attempting to apply functional-notional concepts to the development of a general-purpose language course is that of determining a priori which particular functions and notions should be included. However, when the language-use settings in which the learners will need to employ the language can be reasonably well specified in advance, the development of course content on the basis of functional-notional concepts is much more feasible.

A Combined Approach

It is suggested that for the particular instructional purposes addressed by the Peace Corps, a judicious combination of elements of all three approaches would be the most suitable basis on which to define course content. This procedure, which could be viewed as an "integrated" approach, (McKay, 1980) would specify (1) certain types of settings (i.e.,"situations") in which the volunteers would be expected to operate; (2) the communicative functions associated with these settings, from the standpoint of the volunteer (i.e., whether he or she will need to "request," "counsel," "instruct," "inquire," etc. in those particular situations); and (3) the specific structures that would be employed to transmit informationally accurate and sociolinguistically appropriate messages within the specified situations and functions. For example, one common situation in the Peace Corps context could be buying food in the local market. Within this situation, functions would include appropriate greetings, inquiring about prices, bargaining as appropriate, expressing satisfaction with the purchase, and leave-taking. Relevant notions would include size, quantity, quality, amount, etc. The specific structures used to carry out these transactions would include, for example, the target language equivalents for "Wh-" questions ("how much?," "how many?," etc.).

There are several immediate positive implications of such an "integrated" approach for communicative language training. First, the language being presented is, by explicit planning, directly relevant to the trainee's eventual language-use needs. Second, by virtue of this relevance, the trainee would be expected to be more highly motivated to learn the material because of its perceived utility for envisioned real-life purposes (Ross, 1981). Third, this approach is consistent with recent psycholinguistic research by Krashen (1981) and others which indicates that the more highly contextualized is the language being taught, the more likely it will provide appropriate "input" for language acquisition (by contrast to such de-contextualized language items as would appear in mechanical pattern drills, "made-up" example sentences, or dialogues whose topics are irrelevant to the perceived needs of the students).

Relevant Research Studies

The general approach to content specification described above should be considered a fundamental component of a teaching approach aimed at developing communicative competence. In addition to this basic orientation, there are several further considerations derived from current research findings which are consonant with and complement this approach. The first of these is the "Monitor" model of language acquisition as reported in Krashen (1981). This model recognizes two distinct systems for internalizing linguistic rules in a second language: an "implicit" system, which results in language acquisition; and an "explicit" system, which results in language learning. Language acquisition refers to the unconscious internalization of meaningful language, which permits the learner to use the language for communicative purposes. Language learning, on the other hand, involves explicit attention to rules and forms of the language, and does not in and of itself lead to communicative proficiency. Exposure of the learner to language presented in contexts that are meaningful to the learner will promote acquisition in the sense referred to by Krashen.

Other means for promoting language acquisition include the explicit teaching of vocabulary from the earliest stages of instruction (Krashen, 1978). The rationale for this approach is that early learning of vocabulary appears to facilitate the development of listening comprehension in that it provides the learner the semantic content needed to make sense of spoken utterances.

Meaningfully long periods of listening comprehension practice before the student is required to speak also appear to facilitate language acquisition Newmark (1966). Terrell (1977) describes research in which second language learners who were given the opportunity to listen actively to meaningful speech for an extended period of time at the beginning of the instructional program exhibited significantly greater gains in speaking proficiency by the end of the program than did students who began speaking practice immediately. Postovsky (1974) and Asher (1969) describe other experiments having similar results.

Student interest in and motivation for language learning is increasingly viewed as of crucial importance to effective acquisition. Burt and Dulay (1977) describe what they refer to as an "affective filter" that is either raised or lowered by the learner depending on a number of psychological factors, including the extent of motivation to learn the language, the affective relationships between the learner and the instructor, and the perceived relevance and meaningfulness of the language being presented. Stevick (1976) expresses a similar viewpoint by suggesting that the language learner must not be "on the defensive" if the language learning effort is to be successful.

In summary of all of the preceding discussion, it would appear that an optimum language teaching approach in the Peace Corps context would include the following features:

1) The course content should be focused on the anticipated communicative needs of the trainee, both for efficiency of instruction and to take maximum advantage of the motivational value of this approach.

2) The target language items presented should be highly contextualized, so that the language can be as meaningful as possible to the trainee.

3) The language items presented should be selected on the basis of close consideration of the functional uses, within specified situations, to which the trainee will need to apply the language. Within each functional/situational category, the linguistic structures most appropriate to carrying out the communicative tasks of the trainee should be stressed.

4) Opportunities for the trainee to engage competent speakers of the target language in conversation that is relevant to the interests and needs of the trainee should be frequently provided, both inside and outside of the classroom.

5) Trainees should be exposed to a large amounts of relevant vocabulary, explicitly presented, as early as possible in the course.

6) The trainee should be allowed time to develop a fairly high level of listening comprehension as a precondition to active speech production.

In order to incorporate the above considerations into the teaching program, it will probably be necessary to make use of techniques drawn from several of the methods that were considered generally viable for Peace Corps applications, rather than attempt to make exclusive use of a single method.

In this light, use of the total physical response technique at the initial stages of instruction would be expected to facilitate development of listening comprehension skills necessary to effective later speech production. The presentation of situationally based material in the target language, as provided by the direct method, would provide the type of contextualization that would facilitate language acquisition. The use of communicative games and problem-solving tasks associated with the cognitive-code approach would also represent communicatively meaningful use of the language; and use of the native language, when needed to provide items of information than cannot be readily conveyed in the target language, also would be a useful technique associated with this method. Judicious selection of these and other techniques on the basis of the principles discussed may be considered the approach of preference in developing a methodology that best meets the particular requirements and practical realities of Peace Corps language instruction.

PROFICIENCY TESTING

Consideration of speaking proficiency/communicative competence testing within the Peace Corps can usefully begin with a discussion of the Foreign Service Institute (FSI) interview technique and associated rating scale, which have a long and venerable history of use in this context. The basic qualities of the FSI approach, which contributed in large part to its selection for use in the Peace Corps, include its wide range of proficiency coverage, which extends from a complete lack of any communicative ability in the language (level 0) up to and including performance in the language that is indistinguishable in all respects from that of an educated native speaker (level 5); the fact that the test is theoretically and (assuming the availability of qualified testers) practically applicable to any spoken language; the minimal materials and facilities requirements for administration of the test (test booklets or other stimulus materials are not required, although a tape recorder is necessary if an aural record of the interview is to be preserved); and the verbally-defined score levels on the test, which are readily understandable both by the examinee and by others making use of the test results.

However, the FSI interview was not expressly developed for Peace Corps testing purposes but for use in the context of diplomatic and other representational activities abroad that were being served by graduates of the Foreign Service Institute or other individuals in similar capacities (see Wilds, 1975 and Sollenberger, 1978 for more detailed accounts of the development history of the interview and scoring scale). As a result, the question initially arose, and continues to be debated, concerning the measurement purposes and scoring results of the original FSI interview, as these relate to the presumably somewhat different language proficiency assessment needs of the Peace Corps. It is, therefore, quite appropriate to take a serious, detailed look at the FSI interview in terms of both its validity in Peace Corps use (i.e., the extent to which it properly assesses communicative ability in the specific language-use situations encountered in Peace Corps service) and the degree of reliability with which this assessment is made.

Criticisms addressed to the question of validity have been raised on several occasions in the recent literature and, as discussed in the Overview section, were reinforced by responses and comments in the survey questionnaire and during the on-site visits. The most thoroughgoing critical review of the FSI technique as a measure of general language proficiency has been made by Lado (1978), who identified what he considered three basic limitations of the FSI approach:

(1) the inability of the one-on-one interview format to measure higher-level listening comprehension (in that examinees having a very good level of listening comprehension but limited speaking skill would not be able to fully demonstrate the former ability in a conversational, i.e., actively responding, mode); (2) the difficulty of setting up, in the interviewer-questions/student-responds mode used in the interview, suitable and natural occasions for the student to ask questions of his or her interlocutor--a very important aspect of real-life communication situations; and (3) the inability, in a conversation on a necessarily quite restricted number of topics, to fully probe the extent of the examinee's command of lexicon (especially so when the interviewer is not highly familiar with the examinee's background, personal interests, specific job assignments, or professional activities). Reschke (1978) cites the relative insensitivity of the FSI scale to pedagogically significant increases in examinee performance levels which take place in the course

of instruction but are not reflected in a higher FSI score due to the breadth and "coarseness" of the scoring scale. Clark (1972, 1978) has criticized the FSI level descriptions as involving an inappropriate and potentially confusing combination of functional language-use criteria (e.g., "can order a simple meal, ask for shelter or lodging") and linguistic criteria (e.g., "can usually handle elementary constructions quite accurately").

Notwithstanding the somewhat negative criticisms of the FSI interviewing process and/or scoring procedures to be found in the literature, published reports of the *scoring reliability* of the FSI interview (Adams, 1978) show consistently high inter-rater agreement, with correlations in the high-.80/low-.90 range.

Reliability of FSI Interviewing In-field

Turning to specific Peace Corps experience with the FSI interview, it is unfortunately the case that no rigorous checks (i.e., carefully controlled and formally reported determinations) of the scoring reliability of the FSI interview have been made *in the actual in-field contexts* in which Peace Corps interviewing takes place. Some attempts at monitoring the consistency of scoring of interview testers initially trained by the Educational Testing Service have been made, through the process of having recorded interview samples periodically returned to ETS for spot-checking. Periodic re-training and re-certification of in-field interview testers has also (until this process was discontinued in 1978) been carried out in an effort to maintain the scoring reliability of the interviews. However, neither of these approaches responds fully to the technical--and indeed, practical--need to obtain and report inter-rater reliability figures for the interview *as it is administered and scored in typical Peace Corps situations*. By the same token, determination of the extent to which interview scores for given trainees/volunteers remain constant when the interview is administered and scored by *different testers* (test-retest reliability) would be an appropriate and expected procedure in connection with the use of the FSI interview or of any other measurement technique that would be proposed for use in the Peace Corps context.

In the absence of relevant empirical data to the contrary, serious attention must be paid to the numerous comments received via the survey questionnaire and in discussions with on-site staff which suggest fairly serious concern about the scoring reliability of the FSI interview as it is being employed at a number of training sites. On-site observations to the effect that scores on the interview appear to be "a matter of luck," that "testers tend to be too lenient and assign higher scores than are warranted," "the language coordinator feels that FSI depends too heavily on the tester," and "depends very much on who gives the test" must be taken as quite suggestive, if not formally confirmatory, of scoring unreliability for the interview as actually administered in these settings.

It should also be noted, on the basis of questionnaire responses concerning the specific mode of administration of the interview at the training site (one or two interviewers; with and without tape recording), that the most frequent administration procedure is for a single interviewer to conduct the interview and evaluate the results, without benefit of a second interviewer present (permitting two separate scores to be given for reliability-checking purposes) or of a tape-recorded record of the interview (permitting later checking of the results). Substantial changes in the current interviewing procedure at many sites would thus be necessary in order to accommodate the routine determination of scoring reliability.

It is necessary to emphasize the matter of scoring reliability in evaluating the FSI testing procedure (and other testing approaches) because a satisfactorily high level of reliability is, in addition to being of considerable importance in its own right, a prerequisite for test validity. Regardless of how closely and how appropriately the FSI interview or other testing procedure might reflect the intended communication abilities of the trainee/volunteer, if the actual scores assigned were found to vary appreciably depending on the qualifications of the person administering the test or on other reliability-affecting factors, the obtained testing results would still fail to accomplish the intended measurement purpose of providing a correct and accurate indication of communicative performance.

Validity Issues

As in the case of the scoring reliability question, there appear to have been no systematic efforts to investigate the "communication validity" of the FSI interview in the Peace Corps setting. Such activity would include, for example, detailed statistical comparisons of FSI scores to other carefully developed and administered non-test measures of estimated communicative proficiency, including trainee/volunteer self-assessments of ability to function in a linguistically and sociologically appropriate manner in each of a variety of specified language-use situations; or similar assessments carried out on a "second-party" basis by language instructors, other training site staff or, wherever possible, host country nationals who have been in a position to closely observe the trainee/volunteer's communicative performance in real-life settings.

In the absence of this or other types of formalized validity-related information for the FSI interview as it is used in the Peace Corps setting, attention may be paid to the quite large number of doubts, reservations, caveats, etc. that were expressed in the survey concerning the extent and/or consistency of the relationship between the FSI scores being awarded to trainees on-site and their actual ability to communicate in representative language-use situations.

Validity-related criticisms of the FSI received from the field, including both questionnaire responses and on-site discussions, focused on several different aspects:

(1) Differences between the "standard" language at issue in the FSI interview and the local accents and other nonstandard aspects of speech of the host country speakers with whom the trainee would be interacting during the in-country service. To the extent that pronunciation, lexicon, and in some instances grammatical forms used "in the field" were different from those of the standard language, and to the extent that the trainee used these forms in his or her own speech, the FSI rating based on "standard" language expectations would constitute an underestimate of the trainee's ability to communicate in the actual job assignment situation.

(2) Lack of detailed knowledge, on the part of the tester, of the trainee's field of expertise and/or eventual service assignment (leading to an insufficient ability to probe areas of language use most critical to the trainee's effectiveness in the field).

(3) The inability of the FSI testing process and scoring scale to take adequate account of "body language," proper eye contact, and other nonverbal aspects of communication.

(4) (Most significant of all in terms of the judged "unfairness" of the FSI procedure), the great emphasis placed on grammatical accuracy in arriving at the final interview score. Because of the non-compensatory nature of the FSI scoring scale (i.e., the requirement that all elements of the verbal description associated with a given score level must be met before that level can be assigned), trainees whose range of vocabulary and/or general fluency were at an appreciably higher level than their structural control would be unfairly penalized by receiving a global score no higher than the "lowest common denominator" of their performance.

In view of the fairly appreciable amount of negative commentary received in the survey concerning the FSI technique and scoring scale (including the overall "negative" vote on the question "Does the FSI interview meet your testing needs?": 46% "yes" and 54% "no"), it would seem appropriate to consider what modifications to the current testing procedure (or introduction of new procedures) might better serve the purpose of communicative proficiency assessment in the Peace Corps context.

Basic Considerations in Test Planning

For purposes of discussion, the following assumptions are made:

(1) The testing process, of whatever type is proposed, should address the measurement of listening and speaking skills involved in face-to-face interaction with native speakers of the host country language, as well as gestures and other visual components of the speech situation insofar as they affect the nature and effectiveness of the communication. This orientation immediately

implies the use of a so-called "direct" testing procedure, in which the examinee is face-to-face with a live interlocutor, rather than, for example, in front of a tape recorder, reading aloud from a booklet, or describing printed pictures. (See Clark, 1979 for further discussion of direct and non-direct testing approaches.)

(2) The communicative situations presented in the test should be designed to reflect, to the greatest extent possible, real-life situations in which the trainee will be expected to be able to communicate adequately, including both "daily living" situations common to Peace Corps volunteers and job-related contexts (which may vary for different subgroups of trainees within a given training contingent depending on their particular service assignments). This approach is based on the notion that there exists a common core of expected language-use situations encountered by volunteers, including such contexts as social interactions (greetings, leave-taking, appropriate use of formulas of politeness, etc.); interactions involved in making purchases, traveling, etc.; and other aspects of daily life in the host country setting. The concept of a "common core" of language-use situations has been very usefully applied by Van Ek (1975) in elaborating the "threshold level" for modern language learning by adults. In the Peace Corps setting, the target group for such a specification would not be the tourists and other short-term residents in Europe envisioned in the Threshold Level materials but Peace Corps volunteers during their two-year term of service.

In addition to a common situational core, provision for an additional test component that would be focused more directly on the language-use requirements of the trainee's anticipated job assignment would be intended to address control of relevant specialized lexicon as well as other communication aspects particular to the job assignment.

(3) Assessments of competence made in the course of the test would focus on the major relevant aspects of communicative performance in a real-life context, including, in the terminology of Canale and Swain (1980): (a) grammatical competence (which in the Canale-Swain model also includes lexical control)--not in an absolute sense, but at a level of accuracy required by the particular language-use situations at issue); (b) sociolinguistic competence,

involving the selection and use of an appropriate register, tone, etc. for the particular interlocutor and situation represented, as well as appropriate use of gestures and other visual cues in support of the communication activity; and (c) strategic competence, involving the ability to properly "manage" the conversation by paraphrasing, asking the interlocutor for repetition, clarification, or by the use of other techniques that serve to maintain communication in the absence of the appropriate lexical or structural item. Although considerably more elaborate descriptive systems for the constituent elements of communicative competence have been proposed (for example, Hymes, 1972), the Canale-Swain model is not inconsistent with other more detailed formulations and has the advantage of simplicity and ready comprehensibility to practicing teachers and other non-specialists in the field.

(4) The testing procedures and scoring guidelines, as well as the overall interpretation of test results, would be comparable across languages and training sites, but the realization of the test would vary as appropriate to a given language and sociocultural setting. The concept of effective communication in basic social/daily living situations and job-assignment settings is certainly generalizable on a Peace Corps-wide basis and would constitute the basic touchstone for describing "what the test measures" and how the results are to be interpreted. However, within a given host country and language setting, the specific elements of performance that would constitute effective communication would be expected to vary. For example, while control of verbal tense would be an important aspect of communication in, for example, French and Spanish, this would constitute a "non-problem" in languages that do not have morphologically signaled tenses. With respect to sociolinguistic competence, analogous differences would be seen to exist, for example, between situations in which great social emphasis is placed on elaborate greeting formulas (e.g., inquiry about the state of health of the interlocutor, health of the immediate family, etc.) as a precondition for further conversation, as opposed to other cultural settings in which greeting and leave-taking protocols are considerably less rigid and extensive. The constituent elements of stategic competence would probably be somewhat more uniform across language/culture groups: for example, paraphrasing techniques would be expected to be generally similar in all instances.

Test Development Considerations

With regard to the actual development of a testing procedure based on the preceding assumptions and applicable for use on a Peace Corps-wide basis, it would appear desirable, as an initial step, to develop a fairly detailed description of the language-use contexts that would be considered common elements of Peace Corps service (regardless of the specific language or country in which this service takes place). For example, all volunteers would be expected to engage in and to be able to "handle" routine social conversation, including the ability to give simple biographical information and a general description of "what I do here," as well as to politely seek the same type of information from the interlocutor. Other common language-use contexts would presumably include in-town or in-village activities involving the making of purchases, arranging for transportation, seeking information from or delivering messages to local officials, and so forth.

If the general types of language-use situations and sociocultural roles in which the volunteer would find himself needing to function can be identified and succinctly described, the trainee's ability to function appropriately within these situations would then (ideally) be determined by means of a testing procedure that approximated as closely as possible the actual real-life situations involved. In this regard, one-to-one conversation with a native speaker of the language, with the latter in the role of an "interested outsider" would be both realistic and psychologically appropriate as an elicitation procedure for the "polite conversation" component of the total test, since it is precisely with "interested outsiders" that this type of communication characteristically takes place in real life. However, in order to provide adequate realism and face-validity for other situations included in the test (for example, a request made by the volunteer to a local public official), it would be considered necessary to adopt a role-playing technique in which the sociolinguistic aspects associated with these other situations (and differing in many respects from "polite conversation") could be more naturally and more adequately represented. Thus, in the test, following a period of general conversation in an "interested outsider" mode, a series of a role-playing situations would be established in which the examinee would be explicitly told the nature of the situation; the identity, profession, etc. of the interlocutor; the communication activity that is to be carried out; and other relevant information. Following these instructions, the role-playing situation would take place, with the examiner assuming the indicated role in all respects: manner, tone, choice of lexicon, and so forth. To provide an adequate sampling of situational contexts, it would probably be necessary to present at least three different general (i.e., non job-specific) situations, of perhaps 4-5 minutes each, in addition to the beginning "social conversation" portion of the test. These would be followed by a concluding situation based on an essential communication task associated with the particular job assignment (for example, a nutrition specialist could be asked to explain basic principles of food selection as he or she would be expected to explain them in the field).

With respect to the number of persons needed to properly administer and score a conversation-plus-situation test, it would be strongly recommended to make use of two trained testers--one to serve as the interlocutor (in both the conversation and situation modes), and one to serve as observer and evaluator of the trainee's performance throughout the test. This division of labor would permit a given examiner to concentrate full attention on either effective "stimulus presentation" or close and careful observation and assessment of trainee performance.

From a practical standpoint, routine use of a two-member testing team would appear to require an increase in the number of trained testers, based on survey results indicating that the majority of reporting training sites (68%) currently conduct interviews with only a single tester who simultaneously handles both the test administration and scoring tasks. Again, however, in order to insure that full and proper attention is devoted to both of these aspects (especially in view of the increased complexity of the testing activities), use of a two-person testing team would in all probability be required.

The preceding raises the important question of whether language instructors or other on-site staff who are actually participating in the training program should become formally involved as end-of-training testers. The FSI testing program to date has held the position that only "outside" personnel (or in any event, Peace Corps staff not currently involved in language training) should be used as interviewers and raters, on the grounds that they would be more objective in their evaluations (e.g., less prone to inflate scores, or to modify the interview content so as to emphasize trainee language strengths, etc.) than would on-site staff who could be expected to have a personal stake in the outcome of the testing. Although such a possibility cannot be fully discounted, an alternative view of the possible effects of bringing instructors and other on-site staff actively into the testing process has at least two positive features.

(1) The language instructors and other staff would become more familiar with the nature of and underlying rationale for the test and be able to discern a more direct "cause-and-effect" relationship between examinee performance on the test and the particular instructional activities being carried out. This perception would, in turn, have direct and positive effects on the teaching process, in that (on the assumption that the test were indeed valid for the intended purpose) "teaching to the test" would help to foster the development of the desired communicative competencies.

(2) On the assumption that on-site personnel would be more familiar with trainee job assignments and with other aspects of the trainees' eventual in-field service than would "outside" testers, to engage on-site staff in the testing process and in the actual determination (within established guidelines) of the job-related situations to be presented, would probably result in a more direct and more meaningful assessment of job-related communication than would be possible using outside testers.

A more serious concern in the use of on-site teaching staff for the end-of-training testing is the high level of teacher turnover reported across sites, as discussed in the earlier section on Instructor Selection, Training, and Evaluation. It would not be advisable to carry out extensive tester training activities for teaching staff members who would not reasonably be expected to continue with the program for some period of time. This again speaks to the desirability of attempting to establish more permanent training sites and staff complements than is presently the case.

If it were possible to involve on-site staff in the "official" testing, a number of techniques could be used to increase the likelihood of objectivity and diligence in this activity. First, on-site staff could cooperatively discuss and develop the testing arrangements for a particular contingent, so that information concerning the nature and content of the testing situations to be presented, proper use of the scoring scale, and other relevant items could be discussed and agreed to on a group basis, reducing the possibility of idiosyncratic approaches on the part of particular individuals. Second (assuming that a sufficent number of persons were available on-site), the testing arrangements could be made so that, to the extent possible, instructors would not test their own students or, if it were necessary to become involved in such testing, would serve only as the test administrators (i.e., not as the test evaluators). Third, the language coordinator or other qualified individual could serve an ongoing quality-control function by sitting in on test administrations, monitoring the evaluations made, and helping to maintain consistency in both areas.

Development of Scoring Procedure

The development of an objective, readily utilizable, and easily interpreted scoring procedure for a combined conversational/situational communication test along the general lines described above would be a challenging but by no means impossible undertaking. Relevant considerations include the following:

(1) Inasmuch as one important function of the test would be to determine whether the trainee is (at a minimum) able to carry out the language tasks associated with physical and social survival in the field, as well as those required to perform essential duties of his or her job assignment, the scoring scale should be able to provide, in both a valid and reliable way, a basic "yes"/"no" indication in this regard. Although the behavioral indications of "inadequate" performance would need to be spelled out in greater detail in the course of test- and scale-development, such a level would probably represent the point at which communication is so deficient that its informational and social function is simply not accomplished. For example, trainee communication in the "social conversation" mode would be inadequate when the interlocutor, playing a sympathetic, "trying-to-understand" role (in the manner and to the extent that this would be the case with typical native speakers in the

real-life setting), is unable to obtain the basic information being sought. Inadequate trainee performance here would probably involve primarily grammatical and/or strategic deficiencies, although it would also be possible, at least in theory, for the examinee to fail to meet the basic performance requirement for sociolinguistic competence (for example, by violating pre-conversation greeting rules to such an extent that a native speaker would under ordinary social circumstances either refuse to communicate or be seriously rebuffed.)

Depending on the specific situations represented in the "core" (non-job-specific) section of the test, the criterial attributes of a "failing" or "passing" performance would vary to some extent from those involved in the "social conversation" portion: this variation would be in keeping with the particular interaction demands of these situations in the real-life setting. For example, "buying stamps at a post office" would implicitly require a higher level of communicative efficiency (including rate of speech, adequacy and precision of vocabulary) than would friendly social conversation since, in the post office setting, the clerk would in all probability have neither the leisure nor the inclination to assist and encourage the speaker's communication to the same degree exhibited in relaxed social settings.

It should also be noted that it would be possible to "pass" the social conversation portion of the test but fail the other common-situations and/or job-specific portions of the test: on the assumption that adequate qualification to begin in-field service would include at least minimal performance on all portions of the test, a trainee showing insufficient performance on even one of the component aspects would be considered to have not yet fulfilled all relevant communication requirements. (In a partial-success situation, the test would provide, in any event, an indication of the particular communication areas in which further development would be required.)

(2) It would be anticipated that by the end of the training program a number of examinees would have progressed beyond the minimal performance levels described immediately above. Assessment of "higher level" performance in each of the areas of grammatical/lexical competence, sociolinguistic competence, and strategic competence could be accomplished by referencing the trainee's perfor-

mance, within the "social conversation" setting and in each of the communicative situations, against verbal descriptions of performance developed along the same general lines as the "passing level" descriptions. Existing scale descriptions that could be used or adapted in developing both the "passing" and "higher level" descriptions for each of the three competence areas include those presented in Carroll (1980) and Ingram and Wylie (1981), as well as drafts of scale descriptions that are currently being developed in connection with the "Common Yardstick" project (Clark, in press). Because communicative proficiency approaching the "native speaker" level is for all practical purposes not at issue in the Peace Corps context, either with respect to in-field language needs or as reasonably attainable instructional goals, there would appear to be no need for the developed competency scale, including the "passing level" descriptions, to contain more than four, or perhaps even, three category levels.

Implementation Procedures

Implementation of a communicatively-oriented testing approach along the general lines discussed above might be best approached as a three-stage process of planning, trial administration, and implementation, with satisfactory results in one stage a prerequisite to initiating the next stage. Activities during the planning stage would be expected to include the convening of a small group of Peace Corps in-country language staff, PC/W program staff, and testing specialists to (1) discuss the general concept of and rationale for such a test; (2) attempt to determine, on an across-sites basis, the extent of agreement that would be found for the notion of a "common core" of language-use situations encountered by in-service volunteers generally, irrespective of country of service or particular job assignment, and, to the extent possible, draw up such a list in the course of the planning meeting); and (3) discuss the administrative implications of such an approach with respect to tester training, record-keeping, and score reporting.

If results of the initial meeting were encouraging, the next step would be the development of draft competency descriptions, inventory of core situations, and test administration and scoring guidelines, which could be circulated both to additional testing specialists not associated with the original working group and to other Peace Corps personnel for their reactions and suggestions. Trial administration and scoring of the prototype test might then be carried out both domestically and on-site, including investigation of the scoring reliability of the process. Positive results in all of these areas would suggest the appropriateness of proceeding with the development of a full-scale testing program, including the establishment of procedures for ongoing tester training and quality control.

Three caveats concerning areas of presently-insufficient information within the total testing process described above are as follows. First is the degree and potential impact of departures from exact situational realism in the test. It is of course impossible to duplicate in all respects the actual surroundings in which the situations in question take place in real life; and by the same token, the psychological and affective relationships between the tester and examinee can never be precisely identical to those that would exist between the interlocutors in a real-life setting (cf. Perren, 1967). To the extent that these departures result in examinee speech or communication-related behavior that differs from that which the examinee would exhibit in the actual situation, the face- and content-validity of the test is correspondingly reduced. Care would therefore need to be taken to insure the maximum possible situational realism through careful training of the testers in their role-playing activities, as well as the giving of detailed instructions to the trainees concerning the nature and purpose of the situations and the ways in which they should approach these situations during the test.

A second area of possible concern is the extent to which the language teachers or other testers on-site will be readily able to understand and apply the testing principles involved in both the interviewing/role-playing technique and the communicatively-oriented scoring procedure. With respect to the former, indications from the survey results are that a large proportion of the training sites already make frequent use of interviewing and role-playing techniques during the training course. As a result, formal interviewing/role-playing for end-of-training testing purposes would in many cases not represent a novel experience but a natural extension and further refinement of language training and assessment activities already taking place. With respect to training in the test scoring procedure, although no reliable information is yet available in this regard, it would appear that an evaluation procedure making use of the three categories of grammatical/lexical, sociolinguistic, and strategic competence would be readily understandable if presented in everyday terms, with ample explanation and on-site discussion of live interviews and role-plays held for practice purposes.

A "philosophical" observation may be in order by way of conclusion. The accurate and meaningful assessment of the intended outcomes of instruction, both in the Peace Corps context and elsewhere, is in a very real sense the sine qua non of the instructional process in that it provides both the basic goal toward which the instruction is properly directed and the means through which the extent of accomplishment of these goals can be determined. The development and in-field use of a situationally-based and communicatively interpreted testing procedure along the general lines discussed above would, it is felt, have a major positive influence on the direction and overall effectiveness of Peace Corps language instruction and would, by the same token, provide a readily understandable indication of the success of that instruction in the eyes of trainees, volunteers, Peace Corps staff, and other interested persons. Although a variety of "lower-order" testing approaches might be proposed for this measurement role (for example, the Fiks 1969, recommendation to replace the FSI by the tape-recorded Pictorial Auditory Comprehension Test), and although such approaches might offer easier and more economic administration, they would all fall short of providing the fundamental benchmark of effective spoken communication in real-life settings toward which the instruction would best be directed and on the basis of which it would most appropriately be judged.

ACHIEVEMENT TESTING

A basic distinction that is usually made between "proficiency testing" and "achievement testing" (Clark, 1978) is that the former is directly and exclusively addressed to determining the extent to which the student's performance is congruent with some external standard of accomplishment, regardless of the particular curriculum or methodology followed, while achievement testing is addressed to determining the extent to which the student has learned (acquired, mastered, etc.) specified elements of course content, without regard to the extent to which the course content happens to coincide with some desirable external performance goal. Although achievement testing and proficiency testing are clearly separable in theory, in actual practice they should be as closely congruent as possible, in the sense that what is taught and tested as a matter of "achievement" within the course should be progressively directed toward, and, by the end of the instructional period, ideally synonymous with, the external proficiency standard.

If the general goal of Peace Corps language instruction is to bring the trainee to the point at which he or she is able to use the target language in a communicatively adequate and socially acceptable manner in language-use situations likely to be encountered during in-field service, then the "achievement testing" procedures that are used in the course of the instruction should not be in any way antagonistic to the ultimate development of this type of communicative proficiency, but should foster and encourage its development as the course progresses. An immediate implication of this basic orientation is that pre-developed quizzes and other types of achievement measures that may accompany a given text will be appropriate and useful only to the extent that they reflect or at least increasingly approximate real-life communication: test exercises in the teaching materials returned from the on-site trips or forwarded by the training centers suggest that this is more the exception than the rule, with much of the material being the traditional fill-in-the-blanks grammatical or vocabulary exercises that do not even involve actual listening comprehension or speaking on the student's part. Extensive use of or reliance on these types of testing procedures as indicators of student "achievement" in a course explicitly directed at functional communication would not provide relevant information concerning student progress toward this goal, and as such, use of these tests would be more misleading than helpful to both instructors and students. (Fortunately, on an across-sites basis, only 17% of the respondents indicated that they use "quizzes or other types of tests accompanying the textbook" to monitor trainee progress in the course.)

A second consideration in the achievement testing context is that a number of the more recent methodologies involve teaching procedures in which the instructional elements treated within a given class session are not highly pre-defined but instead grow out of and reflect the particular linguistic and topical turns that the conversation or other class activities happen to take. To the extent that class content is not carefully structured a priori but is derived instead from natural communicative exchanges in the course of the classroom activity, the use of structured, previously-developed tests would be both unfeasible and, in all probability, counterproductive.

An even more significant factor in considering the desirable nature and manner-of-operation for achievement testing in Peace Corps language instruction is the extremely low teacher/student ratio (for the 132 language classes observed on-site, mean and modal class size was 3, with a range of 1-5). Unlike the situation in most regular academic teaching contexts, with typical teacher/student ratios of perhaps 15-30, Peace Corps language instructors are in an extremely favorable position to pay very close, moment-by-moment attention to the classroom performance of each trainee, with the result that they receive immediate and constantly updated feedback in a way and to an extent that is not possible in regular instructional settings. This constant monitoring--from the standpoints of both very high congruence with the language elements that are actually being worked on in the class and the immediate availability of this information (by comparison, for example, to the delay involved in evaluating a written quiz)--is, in a very real sense, an archetypical type of achievement testing, and one that prepared quizzes and similar testing techniques cannot come close to duplicating.

It should be pointed out that the "FSI interviews," "speaking interviews other than the FSI," and "role-playing situations" that were reported as being used with quite high frequency as achievement testing procedures (at 59%, 59%, and 41% of the reporting sites, respectively) would be considered quite reasonable approaches to achievement measurement in the sense and to the extent that they approximate the conversational/situational criterion test discussed in the preceding section. Even more desirable would be the periodic administration, for instructional feedback purposes, of a "trial version" of the criterion test, an activity that would be expected to emanate naturally from the introduction of such as test as the official end-of-training assessment procedure.

METHODOLOGY MATCH TO LANGUAGE

A diligent search of the literature, together with numerous personal contacts and telephone conversations with linguists and second language methodology specialists in the Princeton, N.J. and Washington, D.C. areas, has proved rather nonproductive in regard to elucidating the question of "methodology match to language" (i.e., the selection of a particular language methodology as a function of particular characteristics of the target language). However, it is possible to make some relevant observations in this regard based on the analysis of methodologies described earlier in this report. As discussed in that section, possible mismatches between method and target language would arise from differences in the way that English and the target language are written. In this regard, an important aspect of the counseling-learning approach is that the students transcribe language that has previously been practiced in dialogue form. This poses no problem if the languages involved both use Roman alphabets, since the orthographic skill required transfers readily from English to the target language. However, if the target language uses a different method of writing (for example, a syllabary, as in the case of Hindi or Thai, or an ideographic system such as Chinese), then it would be necessary either to explicitly teach the writing system (a time-consuming activity that does not promote spoken language proficiency directly) or to adopt a transliteration procedure that may be somewhat more quickly taught but is of no intrinsic utility outside of the classroom and is again an intrusive element in the instruction. By the same token, the suggestopedic method is predicated on the availability of similar writing systems for both native and target language and would have the same serious drawbacks as the counseling-learning approach in this respect.

For situations in which some degree of writing skill in the target language is to be developed as an auxiliary goal, the cognitive-code approach easily accommodates this goal because it allows use of the student's native language in classroom explanations and, by this token, permits explicit instruction in writing techniques for the target language. When both languages have a similar writing system, the direct method is applicable, since it is possible to "talk about" (i.e., teach) the target language writing system using the oral target language exclusively.

On a more general basis, it may be suggested that target languages which do not lend themselves well to inductive teaching procedures (at least within the relatively short time periods available for trainee instruction) are more efficiently handled through methods which permit explicit explanations in the student's native language. These would include languages with highly irregular morphology (for example, Arabic, Tagalog, Bahasa Malay), complex tonal properties (Yoruba, Ewe), or misleading similarities to English (e.g., Krio, Liberian English) which would foster overgeneralizations that would be difficult to correct inductively. In such instances, use of a methodology that allows appropriate clarifications to be given in the native language (e.g., cognitive-code) would be considerably more efficient than a methodology that prohibits native-language use or for which the use of native language explanations would represent a mood- or ambience-breaking intrusion into the established classroom procedure (e.g., direct method).

METHODOLOGY FOR "SPECIAL" LEARNERS

As indicated in the survey results, the actual number of both older learners and learners with limited academic backgrounds who were undergoing language training at the time of the survey were very small (see Table 1), averaging about two trainees per site who were more than 35 years old and only about one trainee per site with "no undergraduate education." Notwithstanding the small absolute number of individuals falling into either category, fairly general dissatisfaction with the training procedure for both "older" and "non-academic" learners (who generally tended to be considered and treated as a single group) was expressed in both written survey comments and during the on-site visits, as previously discussed.

The desirability of being able to identify and implement a single, optimum procedure for increasing the efficiency of language instruction for older and/or limited-academic background trainees is certainly to be admitted. Unfortunately, however, reported studies either do not apply closely to the Peace Corps situation or suggest rather strongly that a diversity of teaching approaches, each based on a careful analysis of the background characteristics and particular learning styles of the individuals involved, would be needed to accommodate the wide range of observed differences in these areas.

To characterize quickly the less relevant studies, Burstall (1975) found essentially no differences in French achievement, by age 16, of students who had started their language training at ages 8 and 11; Asher and Garcia (1979) found that Cuban immigrants to the U.S. were increasingly less likely to develop phonological accuracy as a function of their age on entry into the U.S. (which ranged from 7 to 19). Snow and Hoefnagel (1977) obtained contradictory results in a controlled laboratory study in which adult learners (aged 21-31) performed significantly better on a pronunciation test of Dutch words than did students aged 15 and younger.

Unfortunately, none of the preceding studies involved comparisons between language learners in their early 20's (i.e., the bulk of the Peace Corps trainee population) and the "older" learner of approximately 35 and over. By the same token, in a recently-published review of 17 experimental and naturalistic studies on age vs. second language attainment (Krashen, Long, and Scarcella, 1979), 16 of these dealt with learners aged 31 and younger. The remaining study (Seliger, Krashen, and Ladefoged, 1975) dealt with groups aged from 9 to "adult," with the age range of the latter group not specifically defined in the original article.

With respect to appropriate pedagogical approaches for adult language learners, Taylor (1975) recommended a thorough program of structural "review," "contrast," and "re-review" for adult learners of English (age not precisely defined) based on an analysis of overgeneralization errors. A more extensive discussion of factors considered to affect the language learning capacity of older learners is given in a report prepared for the Peace Corps by Roumani (1978). Basing her analysis largely on published literature concerning the effects of age on generalized learning ability, Roumani identifies a number of "physiological obstacles," including decreases in visual acuity, hearing, and response speed in fast-paced tasks (such as rapid pattern-practice drills); and "psychological obstacles," including a generalized "fear of failure," especially in a competitive setting with younger learners, and a tendency on the part of the older learner to prefer to incorporate new learning inputs into an established logical structure rather than to undertake the appreciable restructuring of thought processes involved in the learning of an unfamiliar language.

On the basis of these considerations, Roumani identifies a number of desirable learning conditions for the older language student, including:

(1) attention to insuring the best possible physical conditions for learning (temperature, lighting, acoustics);

(2) establishment of attainable, short-term goals, whose accomplishment will build confidence and a feeling of security;

(3) provision for periods of silence and reflection about the language and the learning efforts being made;

(4) continued personal encouragement and support in the language learning effort, provided by an interested and sympathetic teacher and reinforced by the other students in a cooperative learning effort.

Canadian Public Service Experience

A series of highly relevant and comprehensive studies of adult learner characteristics as these relate to the identification of appropriate teaching methodologies have been carried out under the auspices of the Canadian Public Service Commission and are reported in Wesche (1981). This commission has the responsibility of annually training large numbers of adult learners (average age 36, ranging up to 60) in either French or English as a second language. The teaching program is intensive, involving in most cases six hours per day of language instruction in groups of 6 to 10 persons each.

Experience with the program over a ten-year period has permitted the development of an extensive process of pre-instruction aptitude testing, coupled with personal interviews and a detailed review of prior language learning history, to place the students in one of three different learning programs depending on the particular configuration of testing/interviewing results. The three instructional programs consist of (1) an audiovisually-based "core" course, which presents linguistic structures sequenced by difficulty within tape recorded dialogues; (2) an "analytical" approach, intended for "highly analytical students with strong first language skills and, often, perfectionist tendencies (p. 127); and (3) a "functional" approach, which is directed toward "students who display a relatively restricted mastery of English coupled with good rote memory ability" (p. 128); the latter approach organizes new material according to specific language-use situations, rather than on a linguistic progression basis.

Individual student characteristics--which are determined through the aptitude testing, background information, and personal interview, and which lead to placement in one of the three instructional groups--include auditory ability, phonetic coding ability, grammatical sensitivity, and memory. For each of these characteristics, scores obtained on relevant sections of the Modern Language Aptitude Test (MLAT) or Pimsleur Language Aptitude Battery (LAB), together with consideration of specified "behavioral manifestations" of the same traits (as assessed during the personal interview) are used in making the final assignment to one of the three methods. Behavioral manifestations of low "grammatical sensitivity," for example, include self-reports of "earlier school problems with composition, the understanding and application of grammar rules, and sentence analysis" (p. 132). Students who are evaluated as being low on "grammatical sensitivity" exhibit "particular difficulty in learning the language in a classroom where emphasis is on correct usage rather than on functional communication." Placement of these students (where other relevant indices are also in accord) is usually into the "functional approach" course.

Students revealing auditory difficulties have been noted to require repeated presentation of auditory material, to have difficulty in mimicking this material, and to express the desire to see the material in written form. Instructional treatment of students encountering these difficulties includes placement into "analytical approach" classes (which present material in both spoken and written form) or into "functional" classes, depending on the configuration of other measured characteristics. Students who are evaluated as being low in phonetic coding ability are aided by a variety of changes in classroom activities, including elimination of rote memorization of dialogues and of work with rapid-response oral drills, the frequent review of previously learned aural material, and multisensory presentation of material. Learners with identified memory problems are generally placed into the "analytical approach" classes; specific remedial learning activities include carrying out memorization activities during the morning hours, when the students are most rested; carefully limiting the amount of new material to be memorized at any one time; and making maximum use of reinforcing aids, such as frequent dictation, reading aloud, and writing of vocabulary words on the blackboard.

In addition to carrying out the extensive development work required to determine and refine the placement profiles associated with each teaching method, a validation study was conducted in 1975 (Edwards, Wesche, and Smythe, 1976) which deliberately mis-matched students between the analytical and audiovisual approaches (that is, assigned students who on the basis of the placement criteria should have followed the analytical approach, into the audiovisual program, and vice versa. On three out of four of the end-of-course achievement tests (which were common for both groups), the properly assigned students scored significantly higher than the mis-assigned students and also reported greater interest in foreign languages, a higher level of initiative to practice the language outside of class, a lower level of classroom anxiety, and a more positive attitude toward the teaching method.

The major implication for Peace Corps practice of the Canadian civil service studies is that adult learners cannot be considered "all of a piece" with regard to the personal characteristics that affect language acquisition. By the same token, there would appear to be no single instructional method that would be uniformly applicable to any and all learners within this category.

Recommended Procedure

If this diversity of learning styles and instructional needs is to be acknowledged and dealt with appropriately, some means would need to be developed to obtain reliable information concerning the language learning backgrounds and psychological characteristics of "special" learners entering Peace Corps training, so that this information can be used to appropriately plan or modify the on-site language program for these individuals. With regard to a workable administrative procedure, it would probably not be feasible for in-country training programs to administer the MLAT or other aptitude tests on-site or to carry out elaborate background interviews at the level of detail and sophistication involved in the Canadian program. In any event, for adequate advance planning, it would seem highly desirable for the in-country staff to have relevant information available some time prior to the trainee's arrival on-site.

One possible procedure would be for Peace Corps/Washington to forward, to any Peace Corps applicants whose initial application form indicates an "older learner" or "lesser academic background" status, a follow-up questionnaire covering in some detail the areas of inquiry addressed in the Canadian civil service interviews (e.g., hearing difficulties or other relevant physical problems, school language-learning history if applicable, difficulties encountered in the course of prior language study, etc.). It would also be very advisable to arrange for administration of the MLAT in these two categories. This could be fairly easily accomplished by having the applicant assume responsibility for making appropriate administration arrangements with a school official or other responsible individual in the applicant's home town, to whom the necessary testing materials could be forward by Peace Corps/Washington for administration to the applicant and direct return to PC/W. On the basis of the questionnaire responses and MLAT results, and using the general interpretive guidelines adopted by the Canadian civil service commission, a teaching strategy recommendation would be prepared and forwarded to the training site, outlining the types of classroom activities that would be considered most appropriate for that individual. In view of the small number of trainees involved, one-on-one instruction could probably be provided in most instances, or in any event carefully supplemented regular instruction could be offered, based on the recommendations made.

COMMUNICATIONS RELEVANCE

To the question of the current effectiveness of Peace Corps language instruction in developing communicatively relevant language skills on the part of the trainees, it must be stated that as of the present time there are no formal, quantitative (i.e., assessment-based) procedures available for making such a determination. As discussed in the section on proficiency testing, the FSI interview procedure and rating scale can be legitimately criticized--both on logical grounds and in light of extensive experience with the test on the part of Peace Corps in-country staff--as in many cases not fully corresponding to the trainee's ability to "communicate" in the target language. The development of a conversational/situational testing technique and scoring procedure that more closely reflect the sociolinguistic and strategic elements involved in real-life communication would be a very important means of obtaining considerably more systematic information in this regard than is presently the case.

Self- and Second-Party Ratings

In addition to the administration of a prospective direct test of communicative proficiency are the more indirect but nonetheless useful approaches of obtaining ratings of communicative performance from both the trainees/volunteers themselves and from instructors and other "second-party" individuals who are in a good position to closely observe the trainee's/volunteer's performance in a variety of actual language-use situations. To the extent that the descriptions on which these evaluations are made are couched in terms of the adequacy of performance in specified situations (as opposed to general qualitative descriptions such as "adequate," "good," "superior," etc.), the objectivity and interpretability of these ratings will be enhanced. Prototypical self/second-party rating scales along these general lines have been developed by the Experiment in International Living (1976) and by Educational Testing Service (Barrows, 1981), and portions of the "In-Field Questionnaire for Peace Corps Volunteers" developed by Carroll (1966) are also of this general type, as are a variety of example scales in Oskarsson (1978). If self- and second-party appraisal scales addressed directly to questions of sociolinguistically appropriate communication in specified language-use situations could be developed and used on a routine basis, this would help to provide considerably better organized and more consistent information concerning "communication effectiveness" than is presently available through what are essentially only informal and anecdotal accounts of the communication success or lack of success of individual trainees whose performance is in some way atypical of the expected norm (usually expressed in terms of an unanticipated discrepancy from an "expected" FSI level score).

In the absence of both directly measured and self-/second-party appraisal information on trainee/volunteer communicative proficiency, it is impossible to provide an objective, criterion-based answer to the question of the extent to which current Peace Corps language training methods result in the development of such proficiency. An alternative, and necessarily less direct, approach is to identify a number of instructional practices which, on both logical and research-based grounds, would be viewed as important to the development of communicative proficiency in the target language, and to indicate the extent to which these practices appear to be incorporated in current Peace Corps language training.

Relevant Instructional Practices

A basic consideration in the development of communicative competence on the part of the learner is the provision of appropriate opportunities for language use in realistic communicative settings. This consideration is predicated on a number of investigations which indicate that in order for the learner to develop communicative competence, he or she must perform in language-use situations that require meaningful interaction with competent speakers of the native language, or more specifically, interaction that arises from--and is undertaken to fulfill--basic information-transmitting needs of the learner (Widdowson, 1975; Palmer, 1978; Canale and Swain, 1980). The Peace Corps, through its in-country training program, is in an ideal position to make maximum use of the authentic linguistic and cultural settings in which the trainees would eventually be required to communicate, as part and parcel of its language training process. There is good evidence in the survey results to indicate that many training sites are taking advantage of these learning opportunities through, for example, weekend or longer trainee homestays with host country families, reported to be taking place at 85% of the responding centers.

Within the classroom, the fact that virtually all (95%) of the language instructors are host country nationals would permit highly relevant classroom practice of realistic and culturally appropriate communicative exchanges to take place, provided that there was sufficient flexibility in classroom activities to allow for this type of contextualized interaction. Role-playing would be especially significant in this regard, since it would permit the instructor and trainees to work within each of several different language-use situations, with corresponding modification of lexicon, speaking style and tone of address, and other linguistic and extralinguistic features appropriate to that situation (Savignon, 1972; Van Ek, 1976). Role-playing activities were reported as being "frequently" used at 59% of the training sites. (Classroom observations showed only 21% of the classes visited to be conducting role-playing activities, but a majority of these classes were observed at or near the beginning of the training cycle, and during which role-playing activities would be less likely to be introduced.)

Explicit Instruction in Communicative Techniques

Although classroom role-playing, homestays, and other procedures for providing the trainee opportunities to practice communication in realistic settings appear to be fairly widely used, explicit instruction in techniques of effective communication does not seem to be widely prevalent. For the classroom activity statement, "Trainees are given instruction in important nonverbal aspects of communication in the host country setting (for example, proper person-to-person distance during conversation, appropriate eye contact, etc.)," fewer than half (44%) of the respondents to the survey questionnaire indicated that this was a "frequent" classroom activity. Significantly, in 90% of the 132 language classes visited on-site, the observer did not note any such instruction taking place. To the activity statement, "Trainees are given specific instruction and practice in communicating in the target language by paraphrasing, using gestures, etc. in order to get around deficiencies in vocabulary or grammar," only 39% of the reporting sites indicated "frequent" use, and there were only three such instances noted across the 132 classroom observations. On the assumption that formal instruction with regard to culturally appropriate conversational conventions, as well as to basic conversational management strategies, would facilitate the trainee's acquisition of these competencies (by comparison to non-explicit, "learning-by-doing" exposure), it would appear pedagogically important to provide explicit instruction and practice in both of these areas, beginning as early as possible in the classroom sequence. Such instruction would presumably involve providing the trainee appropriate language and behavior to initiate and end conversations, to request repetition or slower speech on the part of the interlocutor, and to make active use of gestures, paraphrasing, and attention-holding conventions to keep the conversation intact. A recommended related activity would be to provide information about what kinds of persons it is culturally permissible for the trainee/volunteer to engage in conversation, the settings in which such contacts are appropriate, and acceptable/unacceptable topics of conversation within these interlocutor-situation combinations. It should be emphasized, however, that explicit instruction in conversational management strategies would not substitute for practice of these strategies in real-life situations; furthermore, there are some suggestions that certain of the more subtle management strategies are acquired only through extensive real-life interaction (Stern, 1978; Canale and Swain, 1980).

Training in Reception of Communicative Cues

A very important component in the training of culturally appropriate communicative competence, and for which explicit information and practice should also be provided at an early point in the training program, is that of developing a high level of sensitivity on the part of the language learner to both verbal and nonverbal signals of intention and affect provided by the interlocutor in the course of the speech event (Ross, 1981). Quick and accurate perception, by the trainee, of humor, doubt, discomfiture, etc. on the part of the interlocutor, as expressed through choice of lexicon, tone of voice, or gestures or other visual cues, would be an important aspect of the trainee's communicative proficiency, in that it would have a significant bearing on how effectively the trainee could adjust his or her own performance in keeping with these cues. The use of videotapes of conversational interchanges exemplifying various types of affect and intention on the part of the interlocutors would be a useful technique for demonstrating these features; alternatively, two native speakers could be asked to role-play situations of these types which could be observed by the class and commented on by the instructor.

In summary, it would appear that the contexts in which culturally appropriate communicative proficiency is most readily and most effectively developed are already fully available in the Peace Corps in-country training setting. To take maximum advantage of these opportunities, the conscious and wide-scale use of the procedures discussed above would be recommended.

STRUCTURAL CONSIDERATIONS

One of the project tasks was to consider the effectiveness of language training on a decentralized basis (that is, conducted at individual sites within the host country) by comparison to other training models--the latter including the two possible options of (1) all language training conducted stateside, regardless of country of assignment or target language, and (2) in-country training grouped by languages (for example, Spanish language training in Puerto Rico for trainees who would be serving in any of the central or Latin American countries). Without considering the relative financial advantages/disadvantages of language training activities conducted under these three models, an inquiry which is outside of the scope of this project, it is the definite opinion of the project staff--based on its understanding of the communication/cultural goals that Peace Corps language training is intended to address, together with a consideration of fundamental principles of language acquisition within a cultural context--that language training conducted within the particular country in which the trainee is expected to serve is by far the most appropriate procedure. In-country training provides, easily and virtually automatically, a vast number of occasions for outside-of-class language exposure, in culturally authentic contexts, that cannot be duplicated in stateside training and that can be only roughly and imperfectly approximated in out-of-country training grouped by languages. As previously discussed, the opportunity for "immersion" contact with the host-country language as it is being used for genuine communicative purposes within an authentic cultural setting is considered an extremely important factor in the acquisition of corresponding receptive and communicative skills on the part of the trainee; and to not provide this type of exposure as a routine and integral aspect of the language training process would, it is felt, represent a significant backwards step insofar as culturally-relevant communications training is concerned.

If it can be considered that in-country language instruction will continue to be viewed as the most appropriate general mode of operation for Peace Corps language training, the focus of discussion may be turned to the kinds of information, materials, and other support that would be helpful in increasing the efficiency and overall success of the training effort, and to the particular initiatives that could be taken both by PC/W and by the in-country sites in this regard.

With respect to forms of assistance by PC/W to the field, two basic categories of support can be identified: (1) overall program support (involving decisions and arrangements concerning the location and scheduling of training contingents, conditions for hiring and retaining language teachers and other on-site staff, available budget levels, etc.), and (2) dissemination of materials and information relevant to Peace Corps language training, through both printed materials of all types and consultant/workshop activities involving face-to-face rather than "on-paper" communication. With regard first to overall program considerations, one of the most salient and, from a language training standpoint, most disconcerting findings of the survey is the impermanence of the training effort, in terms of both (1) the maintanance of a given training site over more than a relatively short period of time, and (2) (closely related to the first) the retention and continual upgrading of the language teaching staff on an ongoing and reasonably permanent basis.

Program Support

According to the survey results, fully two-thirds of the responding training programs have had one or more changes in the location of the language training site within the past two years. Direct implications of this situation are that functional arrangements of considerable importance to the effective operation of the language training program (location of adequate classroom facilities, hiring and training of teaching staff, and, in many cases, the making of arrangements with local families for homestays) have to be undertaken "from scratch" following each site change, with the attendant inefficiencies and lack of program continuity that this situation entails. By the same token, changes in training site location involve the rather substantial burden of identifying and training new instructors for these programs.

Frequent site changes notwithstanding, the survey data and on-site discussions also reveal the problems associated with a rather high level of instructor attrition, whether as a result of scheduling problems (e.g., university instructors unable to work in Peace Corps training during the regular school year), the 180-days per year working limitation for non-fulltime staff, and other factors. Although the problems involved may be difficult to address from the standpoint of general Peace Corps administration patterns and capabilities, it is undeniably the case that the overall operation and instructional effectiveness of the language training program would be considerably enhanced by the adoption of an administrative structure which would make it possible to maintain the same training sites over a reasonably extended period of time and to obtain and retain a cadre of experienced teachers for service over a number of different training cycles.

Information Dissemination from PC/W to Field

The second major area of Peace Corps/Washington service to the field would involve information dissemination through (a) printed materials and (b) consultant services for training workshops or other types of instruction, either on-site or at appropriate regional locations. The question then arises as to the nature of these materials/consultant services and the location, within Peace Corps/Washington, of the responsibility for providing these services. It is the understanding of the project staff that there are currently no PC/W staff with primary responsibility for language training or language program development as such, and that the country desk officers and/or program staff for each region undertake to provide language-related support along with their other responsibilities.

Although this administrative structure would appear adequate if the information dissemination activity were to be restricted to the forwarding of relevant materials already available at or through PC/W, or the making of workshop arrangements on topics and for purposes that are already well established, it seems questionable that such a structure would be able to efficiently handle the development and dissemination of new publications addressed to the promotion of some of the functional syllabus/communications-training orientations discussed in earlier sections of this report. If it is intended to upgrade the language-for-communication training effort in a principled way and on an across-regions basis (one component of which would presumably be an expanded and updated dissemination effort), it would seem necessary to designate one or more staff members at PC/W who would be able to carry out this and other language-related endeavors as a primary job responsibility rather than as only one of numerous other activities that must be coordinated by the desk officers and program staff.

On the asumption, for purposes of discussion, that an appropriate administrative framework could be established to provide an across-regions approach to language training matters, dissemination activities would usefully include any or all of the following:

(1) Maintenance of updated lists of general resource materials on foreign language instruction as well as of language-specific materials, these lists being distributed either routinely or on request from in-country training sites, together with relevant ordering information. With respect to both the development of such lists and the filling of requests for listed materials, it is suggested that consideration be given to the possible role of the Information Collection and Exchange (ICE) office at Peace Corps/Washington. This resource project, initiated about 1974, has as its primary purpose the dissemination to in-country training sites and other users the most up-to-date information concerning available resource materials in technical areas related to Peace Corps activities (e.g., agricultural training, health services, etc.). Within the recent past, ICE has been working on the preparation of an inventory of language textbooks and related materials in each of the Peace Corps languages; this inventory is presently in the form of a series of index cards containing the relevant bibliographic information, but has not been carried beyond that point. According to the present head of ICE, this area conceives its basic role as that of providing current, selective, and highly useful resources in technical service areas and not in language methodology or other language-related areas per se. However, it would appear to be a relatively straightforward matter to expand ICE operations to include the preparation and dissemination of resource materials in the language training area as well as the filling of in-field orders for these materials.

(2) Preparation and distribution of a periodic language training newsletter highlighting new publications or developments and to which language coordinators or other Peace Corps staff on-site would be invited to contribute. As indicated in the survey questionnaire, 33% of the responding programs report that they have requested information from PC/W concerning "training in the same language at different Peace Corps sites," and 41%, "information concerning language training activities at other Peace Corps sites." This high level of interest in the language training activities and experiences of colleagues at other training sites could be well met through this dissemination means.

(3) Preparation and dissemination of internally-prepared or externally

commissioned materials specifically related to Peace Corps language training (for example, a detailed description of and rationale for new procedures for end-of-training testing of communicative proficiency, if such procedures were to be adopted).

Communications from the Field to PC/W

With respect to information flow from Peace Corps sites in-country to Peace Corps/Washington, there appear to be three basic categories of information that should be received and monitored on an ongoing basis, as follows:

End of Training Reports

End-of-training reports prepared by training contractors or Peace Corps in-country staff concerning the details of operation and outcomes of the particular training project in question should be routinely filed following each project. A review of typical end-of-training reports on file in the LAC and Africa region offices indicates that the language-relevant portions of these reports usually consist of end-of-training (or in some cases, interim) FSI scores obtained by each trainee, together with narrative comments of a few sentences in length concerning the trainee's language learning performance, linguistic strengths and weaknesses, etc. Particularly salient problems or successes in the language training portion of the program are occasionally noted, again in narrative form.

A fundamental problem in making effective use of information from the end-of-training reports is the lack of an established and consistent reporting format. Because of the considerable variation in the way these reports are written up, both across training sites and within individual sites from one training program to the next, it is extremely difficult to draw any useful comparisons or conclusions from the information provided. It is suggested, therefore, that a standardized end-of-training report form be adopted, for which the language-training relevant items would include the following:

- Name and identifying number of each trainee beginning on-site language training. (This information would be needed to coordinate, for research purposes, other training data with trainee age, sex, educational history, and prior language study information drawn from the Peace Corps application form or other sources).

- Results of trainee self-appraisals of language proficiency on entry to Peace Corps training (presumably applicable only for French and Spanish, or rarely for other languages, e.g., Arabic). As previously discussed, it is considered that properly prepared, situationally-referenced self-assessment scales will be able to provide rather fine-grained and reliable information on trainees' functional abilities in the target language at various points in the instructional process. Administration of such an instrument at the beginning of language training in all situations where trainees would be anticipated to have more than "zero level" proficiency would provide important baseline information that would be needed to determine the contribution of training-site instruction to increases in communicative proficiency.

- (For common languages), results of a pre-training administration of the interview/situation test previously discussed in connection with end-of-training assessment. During the initial development and validation of both the self-appraisal scale and the interview/situation testing procedure, it would be important to routinely obtain both kinds of data on the same groups of examinees, to determine the degree of relationship between these two instruments. If satisfactorily high correlations were found between the two types of measures, it might subsequently be possible to make use of only the self-assessment procedure as a pre-training measure, reserving the interview/situation test for end-of-training administration.

- End-of-training results on the interview/situation test for all trainees. (Note: It would also be important to obtain end-of-training self-appraisal data for each trainee. However, the reliability of this information would be questionable if it were obtained just prior to the "decision time" for in-field service, since there would be a high motivation for the trainee to show himself at a satisfactory or higher level of proficiency. Self-appraisal data as related to end-of-training proficiency would be better secured on a retrospective basis some time after the in-field service decision has been made).

- Notation and brief background description concerning any trainee(s) de-selected as a result of language insufficiencies.

- Summary of ratings, by the instructors, of trainees' communicative proficiency at end-of-training, based on the same behavioral descriptions used for the trainee self-appraisals. These appraisals should be provided for both "passing" trainees and for any de-selected trainees.

- Beginning and ending dates for the language training program.

- Language training schedule, showing days per week of language training, daily schedule of language classes, total number of classroom contact hours.

- Total number of trainees and their distribution into language classes.

- Procedures followed in assigning trainees to language classes, including any special classes or tutorial arrangements for older/non-academic learners or other trainees experiencing language learning difficulties.

- Experience and prior service information for each language instructor in the program, including number of previous PC training programs in which the instructor has served; (if applicable) number of years of language teaching experience outside of the Peace Corps; in-service training activities in which the instructor has participated.

- Ratings, by the language coordinator or other supervisory staff, of the teaching effectiveness of each instructor; summary of similar ratings by trainees in the instructor's class.

- Summary statement of the intended goals of the language training program.

- Brief description of the training procedure, including a general indication of classroom methodology, textbook or other printed materials used, arrangements for out-of-class language contacts (e.g., homestays, language integration with other instructional activities on-site).

- Summary appraisal of the outcomes of the training program with respect to the intended goals; description of particular problems or successes encountered.

- Follow-up plans for modification and improvement of later programs.

- Other information concerning the language program that the on-site staff would wish to provide.

Submission, for each completed training program, of a fairly straightforward and simple form that would be common across training sites would provide a much easier and more standardized means of program review than is possible with the current, essentially free-form, reporting procedure. Use of such a procedure would also be of value to on-site staff in thinking through their own program with regard to its goals, the qualifications of the teaching staff, instructional procedures, and outcomes.

Site Facilities Reports

The second type of information that would be recommended for standardized collection involves relatively permanent aspects of the physical set-up at the training site (classroom facilities, available materials, etc.), for which it would not be necessary to have a detailed report following each language training program. It is therefore suggested that the following types of information be obtained on a less frequent basis, no more frequently than yearly, except when changes in training site location require the obtaining of new data in these areas:

o Record of classroom facilities, including size and general configuration of proposed classroom sites. (In this regard, it would be very desirable for Peace Corps/Washington to develop a short list of "minimum classroom specifications," in terms of size, location, lighting, relative freedom from noises or other distractions, which all in-country sites would attempt to meet or exceed if at all possible. On-site administrative staff who are not closely familiar with the particular requirements of language classrooms, by contrast to general purpose classrooms or meeting rooms, may not be adequately sensitive to these needs).

- Record of availability and state of repair of audiovisual and other equipment used on-site.

- Inventory of textbooks and other printed materials used in the language program, with indication of any needed additional materials.

- Overview description relating the location and layout of the training site to out-of-class sources of support for language learning (For example, an isolated training site for which walking trips into town were not feasible would, other aspects being equal, be a less desirable location than one in which this possibility is available. The location of live-in family sites vis-à-vis the training location would also be a relevant factor here.)

As with the first category of information, the gathering and submission of basic data in these areas would have the double advantage of routinely informing Peace Corps/Washington of the overall status of the language training programs and periodically alerting in-country administrative staff to the need to consider these aspects in setting up and maintaining the training sites.

Volunteer-Provided Information

A third and very important source of information from in-country programs to Peace Corps/Washington is that provided by the volunteers themselves. One established mechanism for obtaining this type of information is the volunteer survey that the Evaluation Office at PC/W has routinely been carrying out over the past several years. The most recent survey, distributed in November 1980, contained a number of questions related to the volunteer's language-learning experiences, including the amount of language training received; an evaluative judgment of the quality of the language training; additional language-learning activities in which the volunteer participated during in-field service; and self-appraised language proficiency prior to joining the Peace Corps, at the end of pre-service training, and at the time of completion of the questionnaire.

Since these questionnaires are analyzed on an anonymous basis, there is presumed to be little if any incentive for the volunteer to respond in any other than a candid and objective way, either with respect to his or her own language ability or to various questions concerning the judged effectiveness of the language training received. With respect to self-assessed communicative proficiency, the volunteer could be asked to provide both a retrospective appraisal of the extent to which he or she was able to handle the grammatical/lexical, sociolinguistic, and strategic aspects of communication in the language immediately upon completion of the training program, and judged present level of competence in these areas. Such judgments, used to very good advantage by Carroll in his earlier study (Carroll, 1966) would serve the very important role of an external criterion against which the measured level of "communicative proficiency," as determined by a communication-based conversation/situational testing procedure of the type discussed in the proficiency testing section, of this report could be compared. A high level of congruence between the results of the end-of-training communication test and the self-appraised proficiency level of the volunteer would add important support to the validity of the testing procedure.

Particular aspects of the language training program itself on which the volunteer could be asked to make judgments would be very numerous, including a variety of questions addressed to the training site facilities, the level of qualification and overall effectiveness of the instructors, the methodology used and its relationship to the learning styles and preferences of the volunteer, and many other topics; and it would thus be necessary to choose very carefully those particular questions to be included in a given edition of the survey. In view of the current interest in assessing the overall communication effectiveness of the language training, an early series of such questions might include the volunteers' perceptions of the extent to which aspects of effective communication in addition to language accuracy per se (i.e., specific conversational management strategies, interpersonal aspects of face-to-face communication) were formally addressed during language training. The general point to be made here is that questionnaire-based determination of volunteers' opinions, reactions, and judgments concerning the language training programs in which they have participated can and should be used on a regular and carefully-planned basis to provide candid and presumably quite reliable information on both the nature and the effectiveness of the language training programs--information which both Peace Corps/Washington and the individual sites involved would find highly useful in evaluating and improving their language training efforts.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

A number of recommendations concerning desirable improvements in the Peace Corps language training program based on the survey results and discussions of recent language training trends have been made either explicity or implicitly in the preceding pages. This section is intended to provide a general summary of of these recommendations; however, the reader is urged to refer to the first two sections of the report for more detailed information and discussion in each area.

(1) With the assistance and concurrence of in-country staff, Peace Corps/Washington should develop and promulgate an official, generalized statement of Peace Corps language training goals. Individual language programs would then be expected to prepare more detailed learning objectives consistent with the general goals, as instructional criteria for their own programs. These objectives should be expressed in terms of the particular situations in which the trainee will be expected to make appropriate functional use of the language during in-field service, rather than in terms of particular items of lexicon, grammatical structures, etc., to be acquired. These program-specific learning objectives should be shared with both language instructors and trainees as guides to the anticipated outcomes of the instruction and included in the end-of-training program reports to Peace Corps/Washington.

(2) It is recommended that the general structural approach of in-country language training be continued as highly preferable to either grouped regional training or stateside training, for numerous reasons that are directly associated with the development of culturally appropriate communicative performance on the part of the trainees.

(3) As a matter of first priority, administrative arrangements should be made which will allow in-country training programs to continue in operation at the same site for reasonably extended periods of time. This is necessary to avoid the need for frequent hiring and training of new language instructors--a cost inefficient and pedagogically undersirable situation-- and to permit the continual development and refinement of the language program at that site.

(4) For both part-time and full-time language instructors, an administrative and salary structure should be developed that will permit these instructors to be employed on an ongoing basis at a competitive rate of pay. To the extent that the instructors can come to view their work with Peace Corps language training as a career, rather than as a short-term and chancy activity, there will be an increased likelihood of diligence and effort on their part toward improving their teaching performance.

(5) In situations where year-round language instructors cannot be obtained, language training programs should be scheduled so as to maximize the likelihood of obtaining qualified part-time instructors (e.g., during school/university training periods).

(6) Although, on an overall basis, budgets for language training programs, as well as site facilities and equipment, are adequate, specific attention should be paid to the relatively few sites reporting serious program restrictions as a result of budget and facilities problems.

(7) Specifications for minimally acceptable classroom facilities for language training (lighting, layout, freedom from noise) should be developed and made available to Peace Corps programs in-country and to language program contractors for guidance in site selection and layout of classes on-site.

(8) Because of the wide variation in available facilities, instructor training and background, and other factors, it is not possible to specify a single "optimum" instructional methodology for Peace Corps language training. Considerations which would tend to favor or disfavor the use of given methodologies in particular situations have been discussed in detail in the body of the report. In addition to these considerations, language course planning should take into account recent theoretical and experimental studies in second language acquisition which identify the following as contributing to effective language learning for communicative purposes:

- exposure of the learner to language in contexts that are meaningful and of intrinsic interest to the learner, including both situationally/functionally relevant teaching materials and extensive opportunity for out-of-class language contact.

- extensive listening comprehension practice simultaneously with (or more desirably, prior to) speaking practice by the learner.

- the fostering of a positive attitude toward and high level of motivation for language learning, for which major contributing factors are the psychological relationships between learner and instructor and the perceived relevance of the material being learned.

(9) In view of the great importance, for effective language acquisition, of learner exposure to and practice in using the language within genuine communicative settings that are of personal relevance to the learner, every effort should be made to provide as many out-of-class language contact opportunities as possible, including:

- shared activities with language instructors outside of the classroom setting (e.g., mealtime language tables, recreational activities, etc.);

- homestays with host country families;

- opportunities for in-town activities, including the carrying out of designated language-use "missions" (e.g., obtaining specified items of information from a municipal office).

Such activities are already fairly widely reported, but should be emphasized as a basic component of the total language learning process rather than as a peripheral or secondary activity.

(10) Consistent with the general principle of language exposure and use in functionally relevant situations, classroom role-playing and opportunities for unstructured or semi-structured conversational interchanges between teacher and trainees on topics of interest to the trainees should be encouraged.

(11) Trainees should be given more explicit instruction in conversation-management techniques, including paraphrasing, use of gestures, requesting repetition on the part of the interlocutor, and so forth. Verbal formulas and gestures associated with initiating and ending conversations should be taught,

as well as such paralinguistic features as proper eye contact, appropriate distance between speakers, etc.

(12) Trainees should receive instruction and practice in perceiving affective elements of the interlocutor's speech (humor, doubt, hesitation, etc.) as an important aspect of their own communicative competence.

(13) Arrangements should be made to identify, prior to in-country training, those applicants who would be considered likely to encounter language learning difficulties, either as a function of age or academic background. A suggested procedure is to obtain questionnaire and aptitude test-based information for these individuals, on the basis of which specific recommendations for appropriate instructional approaches would be forwarded to the training sites involved.

(14) The FSI interviewing technique and scoring scale have come under what appears to be legitimate criticisms of (a) the scoring reliability of the test as it is presently being administered in-country, and (b) operational validity as a close indicator of communicative effectiveness. It is therefore recommended that consideration be given to the development of a more comunicatively-oriented procedure for end-of-training language assessment along the general model described in the proficiency testing section of this report.

In the absence of such a criterion measure of communicative proficiency, there is no face- and content-valid metric of this performance and, by the same token, no effective means of determining the success or lack of success of the language training program in developing communicative proficiency on the part of the trainees.

(15) If a communicatively-oriented assessment procedure to replace the FSI interview is not developed, a decision should be made very quickly on whether or not the FSI testing procedure should continue to be used as an end-of-training criterion measure. Since FSI tester training and retraining/recertification are not currently being carried out, it is highly likely that there will be a continuing attrition of trained interviewers (7 sites presently report no available testers) and that the interviewing techniques

and scoring reliability of the remaining testers will decline in the absence of retraining opportunities.

(16) Attention should be paid to the development of highly objective, behaviorally-oriented descriptive scales for trainee/volunteer self-rating of communicative proficiency. Such rating scales are of high potential value in the following applications:

- as an aid in the placement of trainees who already have some degree of proficiency in the target language on entry into training;

- as one means of validating the proposed conversation/situation-based criterion proficiency test;

- as a measure of the overall outcomes of individual language training programs, as determined by the distribution of proficiency self-ratings of trainees completing the program.

(17) The development of behaviorally-oriented rating scales to be used by "second-party" evaluators in appraising the communicative competence of trainees/volunteers is recommended both in connection with test validation and in its own right as an additional indicator of training program effectiveness.

(18) Formal classroom achievement testing is of considerably less relevance and usefulness in the Peace Corps context than in regular academic settings. It is suggested that greater attention be paid to ongoing evaluation of the trainee's performance in the course of regular classroom work than to the administration of prepared achievement tests. Interviews and role-playing situations carried out as part of the classroom work may be very appropriately used as achievement measures, with immediate instructional feedback.

(19) Consideration should be given to designating one or more staff members at Peace Corps/Washington to take primary responsibility for language-training related matters on an across-regions basis. This would facilitate the development and dissemination of up-to-date resource materials for language

instruction (desirably through the Information Collection and Exchange Office at PC/W) as well as other relevant publications, including possibly an inter-training site newsletter and special-purpose materials prepared by or at the request of Peace Corps/Washington in areas of current interest or importance to the language training program.

(20) To provide consistent and readily interpretable information on the nature and results of in-county language training programs, procedures should be developed to request and obtain from the field standardized end-of-training reports following each language training program, these reports to include a statement of program objectives, a brief description of the training procedure and schedule, instructor characterisitcs, and trainee outcomes as measured by instructor ratings of trainee performance as well as results of administration of a direct test of communicative proficiency.

To systematically obtain basic data on language training facilities in-country, a periodic report from each training site is recommended, covering size and configuration of classrooms, availability and state of repair of audiovisual equipment, inventory of textbooks and other materials, etc. This information would not be needed more frequently than yearly, unless there were an intervening change of training site.

(21) It is recommended that fullest possible use be made of a variety of different types of language-related information that can be provided by volunteers in the field, including both proficiency self-appraisals and observations on the nature and quality of the language training process. Self-reports of communicative proficiency at end-of-training could be related to communicative proficiency test scores (assuming that such an instrument were available) for construct validation purposes, and volunteers' observations concerning their language training experience would provide useful feedback information on both the particular training program in which the volunteers participated and language training matters generally. The annual volunteer survey conducted by the Evaluation office at PC/W would provide an already-established and efficient means of obtaining this type of information.

References

Adams, Marianne L. "Measuring Foreign Language Speaking Proficiency: A Study of Agreement Among Raters." In: Clark, John L. D., ed., Direct Testing of Speaking Proficiency: Theory and Practice. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1978, pp. 129-149.

Alexander, L. G. "Threshold Level and Methodology." Supplemental chapter in J. A. Van Ek, Significance of the Threshold Level in the Early Teaching of Modern Languages. Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 1976.

Alexander, L. G. "Where Do We Go From Here? A Reconsideration of Some Basic Assumptions Affecting Course Design." English Language Teaching, vol 30, no. 2, 1976, pp. 89-103.

Asher, James J. Learning Another Language Through Actions: The Complete Teacher's Guidebook. Los Gatos, Calif.: Sky Oak Productions, 1977.

Asher, James J. "The Total Physical Response Approach to Second Language Learning." Modern Language Journal, vol. 53, no. 1, 1969, pp. 3-17.

Asher, James J. and Ramiro Garcia. "The Optimum Age to Learn a Foreign Language." Modern Language Journal, vol. 53, no. 5, 1969, pp. 334-341.

Barrows, Thomas S. College Students' Knowledge and Beliefs: A Survey of Global Understanding. New Rochelle, N.Y.: Change Magazine Press, 1981.

Brown, H. Douglas. "Some Limitations of C-L/CLL Models of Second Language Teaching." TESOL Quarterly, vol. 11, no. 4, 1977, pp. 365-372.

Burstall, Clare. "Primary French in the Balance." Educational Research, vol. 17, June 1975, pp. 193-198.

Bushman, R., and H. Madson. "A Description and Evaluation of Suggestopaedia--A New Teaching Methodology." In: Fanselow, John, and Ruth Crymes, eds., On TESOL '76. Washington, D.C.: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, 1976.

Canale, Michael, and Merrill Swain. "Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approaches to Second Language Teaching and Testing." Applied Linguistics, vol. 1, no. 1, 1980, pp. 1-47.

Carroll, Brendan J. Testing Communicative Competence. London, Pergamon, 1980.

Carroll, John B. A Parametric Study of Language Training in the Peace Corps. Cambridge, Mass.: Laboratory for Research in Instruction, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University, 1966.

Chastain, Kenneth D. "A Methodological Study Comparing the Audio-Lingual Habit Theory and the Cognitive Code-Learning Theory--A Continuation." Modern Language Journal, vol. 54, no. 4, 1970, pp. 257-263.

Chastain, Kenneth D. *Developing Second Language Skills: Theory to Practice*, 2nd ed. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1976.

Chastain, Kenneth D. and Frank Woerdehoff. "A Methodological Study Comparing the Audio-Lingual Habit Theory and the Cognitive Code-Learning Theory." *Modern Language Journal*, vol. 52, no. 5, 1968, pp. 268-278.

Clark, John L. D. "Direct vs. Semi-Direct Tests of Speaking Ability." In: Briere, Eugene J., and Frances B. Hinofotis, eds., *Concepts in Language Testing: Some Recent Studies*. Washington, D.C.: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, 1979, pp. 35-49.

Clark, John L. D. *Foreign Language Testing, Theory and Practice*. Philadelphia, Pa.: Center for Curriculum Development, 1972.

Clark, John L. D. "Psychometric Considerations in Language Testing." In: Spolsky, Bernard, ed., *Approaches to Language Testing*. Arlington, Va.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1978, pp. 15-30.

Clark, John L. D. "Toward a Common Measure of Speaking Proficiency: Progress Report." Paper read at 1981 Georgetown Round Table Preconference on Speaking Proficiency Testing, March 1981 (in press).

Curran, Charles A. *Counseling-Learning in Second Languages*. Apple River, Ill.: Apple River Press, 1976.

Dulay, H., and M. Burt. "Research on Creativity in Language Acquisition," In: Burt, M., ed., *Viewpoints on English as a Second Language*. New York: Regents Publishing Co., 1977, pp. 95-126.

Edwards, H. P., M. B. Wesche, and F. Smyth. *Psychological Predictors of Success in Second Language Training*. Report of the Independent Study on the Language Training Programs of the Public Service of Canada, 3. Ottawa: Public Service Commission of Canada, 1976.

Experiment in International Living. *Your Objectives, Guidelines, and Assessment: An Evaluation Form of Communicative Competence*. Brattleboro, Vt.: Experiment in International Living, 1976.

Fanselow, John. *Beyond Rashomon: Foci for Observing Communications Used in Second Language Instruction*. New York: Columbia Teachers College, 1975.

Fiks, A. *On the Possibility of Improved Language Proficiency Measurement in the Peace Corps*. Arlington, Va.: Fiks Associates, 1969.

Gattegno, Caleb. *The Common Sense of Teaching Foreign Languages*. New York: Educational Solutions, 1976.

Gattegno, Caleb. *Teaching Foreign Languages in the Schools: The Silent Way*. New York: Educational Solutions, 1972.

Hymes, D. "On Communicative Competence." In: Pride, J. B., and J. Holmes, eds., *Sociolinguistics*. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books, 1972.

Ingram, David E. and Elaine Wylie. Australian Second Language Proficiency Ratings. Brisbane, Australia: Adult Migrant Education Program, 1981.

Kelley, L. G. Twenty-Five Centuries of Language Learning. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1969.

Krashen, Stephen D. "The Monitor Model for Second-Language Acquisition." In: Gingras, R., ed., Second-Language Acquisition and Foreign Language Teaching. Arlington, Va.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1978.

Krashen, Stephen D. Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning. Oxford: Pergamon, 1981.

Krashen, Stephen D., Michael A. Long, and Robin C. Scarcella. "Age, Rate, and Eventual Attainment in Second Language Acquisition." TESOL Quarterly, vol. 13, no. 4, 1979, pp. 573-582.

Kunihara, Shirov, and James J. Asher. "The Strategy of the Total Physical Response: An Application to Learning Japanese." International Review of Applied Linguistics, vol. 3, no 4, 1965, pp. 277-289.

Lado, Robert. "Scope and Limitations of Interview-Based Language Testing: Are We Asking Too Much of the Interview?" In: Clark, John L. D., ed.: Direct Testing of Speaking Proficiency: Theory and Application. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1978, pp. 113-128.

LaForge, Paul. "Community Language Learning: A Pilot Study." Language Learning, vol. 21, no. 1, 1971, pp. 45-62.

Little, Arthur D., Co. Design of an Information System for Peace Corps Language Training. Cambridge, Mass.: Arthur D. Little Co., March 1970.

Lozanov, G. Suggestology and Outlines of Suggestopedy. New York: Gordon and Breach, 1978.

McKay, Sandra. "Towards and Integrated Syllabus." In: Croft, Kenneth, ed., Readings on English as a Second Language for Teachers and Teacher Trainees, 2nd edition. Cambridge, Mass.: Winthrop Publishers, Inc., 1980, pp. 72-84.

Moskowitz, Gertrude. "Interaction Analysis--A New Modern Language for Supervisors." Foreign Language Annals, vol. 5, 1971, pp. 211-221.

Newmark, Leonard. "How Not to Interfere with Language Learning." Language Learning: The Individual and the Process. International Journal of American Linguistics, vol. 40, 1966, pp. 77-83.

Oskarsson, Mats. Approaches to Self-Assessment in Foreign Language Learning. Strasbourg: Council for Cultural Cooperation - Council of Europe, 1978.

Palmer, Adrian S. "Measures of Achievement, Communication, Incorporation, and Integration for Two Classes of Formal ESL Learners." Paper read at 5th AILA Congress, Montreal, 1978.

Perren, George. "Testing Ability in English as a Second Language, 3 - Spoken Language." English Language Teaching, vol. 22, 1967, pp. 197-202.

Postovsky, Valerian A. "Effects of Delay in Oral Practice at the Beginning of Second Language Learning." Modern Language Journal, vol. 58, 1974, pp. 229-239.

Racle, G. "The Key Principles of Suggestopaedia." Journal of Suggestive-Accelerative Learning and Teaching, vol. 1, no. 3, 1976, pp. 149-163.

Reschke, Claus. "Adaptation of the FSI Interview Scale for Secondary Schools and Colleges." In: Clark, John L. D., ed. Direct Testing of Speaking Proficiency: Theory and Application. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1978.

Rivers, Wilga M. The Psychologist and the Foreign Language Teacher. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Ross, David. "From Theory to Practice: Some Critical Comments on the Communicative Approach to Language Learning." Language Learning, vol. 31, no. 1, 1981.

Roumani, Judith. Foreign Language Learning for Older Learners: Problems and Approaches. Washington, D.C.: Peace Corps, 1978 (mimeo).

Savignon, Sandra J. Communicative Competence: An Experiment in Foreign-Language Teaching. Philadelphia: Center for Curriculum Development, 1972.

Seliger, Herbert W., Stephen D. Krashen, and Peter Ladefoged. "Maturational Constraints in the Acquisition of Second Language Accent." Language Sciences, no. 36, 1975, pp. 20-22.

Smith, Philip D., Jr. A Comparison of the Cognitive and Audiolingual Approaches to Foreign Language Instruction. Philadelphia: Center for Curriculum Development, 1970.

Snow, Catherine E., and Marion Hoefnagel-Hohle. "Age Differences in the Pronunciation of Foreign Sounds." Language and Speech, vol. 20, part 4, 1977, pp. 357-365.

Sollenberger, Howard E. "Development and Current Use of the FSI Oral Interview Test." In: Clark, John L. D., ed., Direct Testing of Speaking Proficiency: Theory and Application. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1978.

Stern, H.H. "The Formal-function Distinction in Language Pedagogy: A Conceptual Clarification." Paper read at the 5th AILA Congress, Montreal, 1978.

Stevick, Earl. Teaching Languages: A Way and Ways. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1980.

Stevick, Earl. *Memory, Meaning, and Method*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1976.

Taylor, Barry P. "Adult Learning Strategies and Their Pedagogical Implications." *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 9, no. 4, pp. 391-399.

Terrell, Tracy. "A Natural Approach to Second Language Acquisition and Learning." *Modern Language Journal*, vol. 61, pp. 325-337, 1977.

Van Ek, J. A. *Significance of the Threshold Level in the Early Teaching of Modern Languages*. Strasbourg: Council for Cultural Cooperation - Council of Europe, 1976.

Van Ek, J.A. *Systems Development in Adult Language Learning*. Strasbourg: Council for Cultural Cooperation - Council of Europe, 1975.

Wesche, Marjorie B. "Language Aptitude Measures in Streaming, Matching Students with Methods, and Diagnosis of Learning Problems." Ch. 5 in Diller, Karl C., ed., *Individual Differences and Universals in Language Learning Aptitude*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1981, pp. 119-154.

Widdowson, H. G. "Two Types of Communication Exercise." In: Widdowson, H.G., ed., *Explorations in Applied Linguistics*. London: Oxford University Press, 1975.

Wilds, Claudia P. "The Oral Interview Test." In: Jones, Randall L., and Bernard Spolsky, eds., *Testing Language Proficiency*. Arlington, Va.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1975, pp. 29-44.

Wilkins, David A. *Notional Syllabuses*. London: Oxford University Press, 1976.

Appendix A

1961 PEACE
1981 CORPS

806 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20525

April 20, 1981

MEMORANDUM

TO: All Country Directors

FROM: Dan Edwards, Associate Training Specialist, OPTC

SUBJ: The Attached Questionnaire

As indicated in a recent cable from Bill Sykes (State 094969), Educational Testing Service has been contracted by Peace Corps to conduct a survey of the status of language training in the Peace Corps. We believe this project to be very important to the future of language training. No systematic study or focus has been directed to language improvement for over ten years. A very important initial step in this process is to obtain detailed feedback from each country concerning your language training activities and suggestions for improving the training process. This information, when collected on a Peace Corps-wide basis will give us the ability to analyze trends and push for needed improvements.

Enclosed with this letter is a copy of the "Peace Corps Language Survey." The completed questionnaire should be returned via air mail or pouch (whichever is faster) using the enclosed pre-addressed envelope. Due to the extremely short time period in which the entire project must be completed, we are requesting your immediate attention and assistance in completing and returning this information.

Because of the several different areas (general information, language program staffing, on-site facilities, classroom activities, language training goals, and other areas) that are being addressed, the questionnaire is, necessarily, fairly lengthy; we did try to make it as efficient as possible, and all regional training officers have worked over the questionnaire for input and basic good sense.

We sincerely hope that you will be willing to respond to it as quickly as possible after receipt. ETS has requested a three-day turn-around time if at all possible, but five days would be acceptable if necessary. We do recognize the kind of pressure you work under (having been there ourselves). This request for quick turn-around is due to the fact that the information which comes from this survey will be used to inform and focus the on-site field visits which are set up for summer training in June and July. These visits will be made to selected typical countries by language experts to give us another slice of information.

When the overall reports are completed for all phases by September, we will distribute a copy to each of you. We appreciate your cooperation in advance, and hope this effort will be helpful to our efforts in promoting quality in training. Thanks.

cc: Val Mezainis, Actg Dir/OPTC
Jim McCaffery, Training Spec/OPTC
Regional Training and Programming Units
CORE Senior Staff

PEACE CORPS
LANGUAGE SURVEY

The Peace Corps is conducting a detailed survey of language training at in-country sites worldwide as part of a comprehensive data-gathering project. The survey will consist of this questionnaire, visits to selected in-country sites, and a review of language training activities outside the Peace Corps.

We are, therefore, requesting your timely and careful assistance in providing the information asked for in the following pages. You should either complete the questions yourself or ask the language coordinator or other members of your staff who would be able to provide the requested data. It is quite possible that two or more people will be needed to complete this questionnaire.

It is important to secure complete responses. We request that every effort be made to answer all of the questions. If you or your staff are not sure of the answer to a particular question, please give your best estimate.

Throughout the questionnaire, a number of "write-in" comments are asked for in addition to "check-mark" (✓) answers. The write-in comments are a necessary and important component of the total questionnaire. We therefore ask that you give special attention to providing this written information wherever it is requested.

This project has an extremely short time period (March-September 1981). This questionnaire is the first of several phases that must be completed within this time. We therefore request that you complete and return this questionnaire within THREE WORKING DAYS of its receipt in-country. A preaddressed return envelope has been provided. Please use the fastest means possible in returning the questionnaire. This could be pouch or airmail depending on your location.

Your help in this project is most appreciated. We would like to thank you not only for your time and your cooperation, but also for your suggestions and opinions regarding effective language instruction in the Peace Corps.

PLEASE PRINT OR WRITE LEGIBLY

PEACE CORPS LANGUAGE SURVEY.

A. GENERAL INFORMATION

1. For analysis purposes it is necessary to know who is completing any part of this questionnaire. (Please check all that apply.)

15% Peace Corps Director

56% Associate Peace Corps Director

37% Language Coordinator

49% Other (Please describe.)

2. This Peace Corps program is located in (see text) (country).

3. Approximately how many language training programs (with at least five trainees each) have been held in the last two years at this training site? (see text).

4. The primary language taught in the language training program (for example, French) is (see text).

5. The secondary language taught (if applicable) in the language training program (for example, the local language) is (see text).

B. INFORMATION ABOUT LANGUAGE TRAINING COURSES

Questions 1-20 are about the MOST RECENTLY COMPLETED language training course at this site.

1. When did the language training begin? (see text) (Month) (Year)

2. When did the training end? (see text) (Month) (Year)

3. How many days a week did the language classes regularly meet?

4 days/week: 1 center
5 days/week: 15 center
6 days/week: 22 center
7 days/week: 1 center
(blank: 2)

4. Please check which days classes were held.

10% Sunday 98% Monday 98% Tuesday 100% Wednesday

100% Thursday 95% Friday 66% Saturday

5. How many hours per day did the classes regularly meet? (see text)

6. Approximately how many instructor-student classroom hours did a given trainee receive during the total language training course?

(see text) hours in primary language training course

(see text) hours in secondary language training course

7. The language taught (target language) was (see text).

8. During a typical class session, approximately what percentage of the instructor's speech was either in the target language or in English?

_____ % in target language _____ % in English

9. During a typical class session, approximately what percentage of the trainee's speech was either in the target language or in English?

_____ % in target language _____ % in English

10. Which one or more of the following language training methodologies were used? (check all that apply.)

76% Audiolingual 61% Direct Method

7% Suggestopedia 49% Silent Way

22% Physical Response Method 41% Traditional (Grammar-Translation)

56% Counseling-Learning/Community Language Learning

10a. If more than one methodology was used, please explain how this was done.

_____

_____

_____

10b. If some other language training methodology not listed was used, please describe.

____

____

____

11. Was the instructional approach or the content of the language training modified or directed towards the type of job trainees will be doing?

88% Yes   12% No

11a. If Yes, please describe these modifications. ____________________

____

____

____

11b. Was the language training integrated with any of the following areas? (Check all that apply.)

85% Technical training related to the trainees' work assignment

54% Health & sanitation

98% Culture & customs of host country

15% Other? (Please describe.) ____________________

____

____

12. The number of full-time language instructors was (see text).

13. The number of part-time language instructors was (see text).

14. The name of the training class was ____________________.

15. The total number of trainees in the language program was __________.

16. How many trainees were in the following age groups? (see text)

___ 25 or under ___ between 26-35 ___ between 36-50 ___ 51 or over

17. How many trainees were male and female? (see text)

_____ Male _____ Female

18. How many trainees had no undergraduate education? (see text)

19. How many trainees had either some college education or an undergraduate degree? (see text).

20. How many trainees had more than an undergraduate degree? (see text)

21. Were most of the other language training programs given in the past two years in this country similar to the current program in the following ways? (Check YES or NO for each statement.)

	YES	NO
Most language training programs were about the same length.	85%	15%
The same language(s) were taught.	92%	8%
The language courses were taught at the same location.	33%	67%
The language training courses had about the same number of full-time instructors.	42%	58%
The total number of trainees was similar.	23%	77%
The ages of the trainees were similar.	68%	32%
The number of males and females was similar.	55%	45%
They were trained for similar jobs.	55%	45%
The ratio of instructors per class size was about the same.	90%	10%

21a. If you checked ( ) "NO" to any of the above statements, please explain what the differences were.

22. Overall, how would you rate the current language training program? (Check one.)

(1) 25% Excellent (2) 60% Good (3) 15% Fair (4) 0% Poor

23. Do you have any special language training courses for older trainees at this site?

23% Yes 78% No

23a. If "Yes", please describe briefly the training method that is used.

24. Do you have any special language training courses for trainees with little academic background?

13% Yes 87% No

24a. If "Yes", please describe briefly the training method that is used.

25. In your opinion, about how many hours per day for how many days a week for how many weeks is ideal for the following trainees in a language training program? (Please estimate.)

	Number of Hours Per Day	Number of Days Per Week	Number of Weeks
	(see text)		
For trainees with some college training	____	____	____
For trainees with little academic background	____	____	____
For older trainees	____	____	____

26. Are you satisfied with the language training for older trainees?

26% Yes 74% No (Base N=35)

26a. If No, please explain.

27. Are you satisfied with the language training program for trainees with little academic background?

65% Yes 35% No (N=31)

27a. If No, please explain.

C. INSTRUCTOR SELECTION AND TRAINING

Please answer the following questions from your general knowledge of the language training program at this site.

1. Who usually selects the language instructors? (Check all that apply.)

   41% The Peace Corps staff

   80% The language coordinator

   32% An outside contractor

   17% The more experienced language instructors

   0% An outside consultant other than the contractor

   36% Other (Please describe.) ______

2. What is the general availability of language instructors at your training site? (Check one.)

   (1) 59% More instructor candidates are available than are needed for the program.

   (2) 24% There are enough instructors but no surplus.

   (3) 17% It is difficult to obtain enough instructors.

3. Are there certain times of the year when language instructors are more available than at other times?

   77% Yes   23% No

3a. If "Yes", please describe. ______

4. On the whole, how well qualified are the language instructors? (Check one.)

   (1) 10% They are poorly qualified.

   (2) 10% They are minimally qualified.

   (3) 54% They are adequately qualified.

   (4) 27% They are well qualified.

5. Are there regular procedures for reviewing or evaluating language instructors once they are hired?

   85% Yes   15% No

5a. If "Yes", please describe who conducts the evaluation and how it is done.

5b. If language instructors are evaluated, how often are they evaluated?

6. Are newly hired language instructors given any specific training before they begin teaching at this site?

98% Yes 2% No

If "Yes", please answer each of the following questions.
If "No", go on to Question 7.

6a. What is the average number of contact hours of training the instructors receive? _____ hours
(see text)

6b. Who conducts this training? (Check all that apply.)

29% The Peace Corps director or other Peace Corps staff

83% The language coordinator

24% An outside language contractor

46% The more experienced language instructors

15% An outside consultant (other than the language contractor)

32% Other (Please describe.) ______

6c. What does the training involve? (Please describe.) ______

7. Approximately what percentage of the language instructors at your site have the following qualifications? (Please estimate a percentage for each statement.) (Percentages shown are averages across sites.)

93 % have native proficiency in the language

78 % have had some previous teaching experience

95 % are citizens of the host country

1 % are United States citizens

2 % are citizens of another foreign country

64 % have had previous experience teaching the target language in the Peace Corps

39 % have had previous experience teaching the target language outside the Peace Corps

40 % have a university or college degree

D. LANGUAGE TRAINING PROGRAM STAFFING

Please answer the following questions from your general knowledge of the language training program at this site.

1. Is there a Peace Corps staff person whose primary responsibility is to coordinate the language training program?

38% Yes 62% No

1a. If No, how is the language training program coordinated? (Please describe.)

2. Are consultants sometimes used to plan or review the language training program?

_68%_ Yes   _33%_ No

2a. If "Yes", how are they used? (Please describe.) ____________________

E. LANGUAGE TRAINING PROGRAM EQUIPMENT

Below is a series of questions about equipment that may be used at this training site. Place a check (√) in the appropriate columnS. If there is any other equipment not listed, please write it in at the bottom of the page and then check the appropriate columns.

Equipment	Available on site?			Available locally?			How often is it used?				What is the condition of the equipment?				Is there an adequate supply?			Can repairs be made easily?		
	Yes	No	NR	Yes	No	NR	Seldom (1)	Moderately (2)	Frequently (3)	NR	Poor (1)	Usable (2)	Good (3)	NR	Yes	No	NR	Yes	No	NR
1. Xerox	31	56	14	72	6	22	28	22	36	14	8	33	42	17	53	22	25	39	31	31
2. Mimeograph	67	22	11	58	0	42	8	14	64	14	14	25	44	17	75	8	17	47	31	22
3. Spirit Stencil	25	56	19	42	28	31	22	6	22	50	3	14	22	61	33	6	61	22	11	67
4. Tape Recorders																				
Reel to Reel	6	53	42	19	28	53	--[1]	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Cassette	89	3	8	58	0	42	11	61	17	11	11	39	39	11	56	31	14	42	36	22
5. Video Recorders	14	69	17	25	42	33	25	6	0	69	3	6	17	75	19	14	67	11	19	69
6. Loudspeakers																				
Reel to Reel	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Cassette	14	61	25	19	39	42	17	3	3	77	0	3	11	86	17	6	78	14	8	78
7. Film Projector	53	36	11	56	3	42	47	31	3	19	8	28	39	25	50	19	31	31	36	33
8. Film Screen	44	44	11	50	17	33	44	25	3	28	3	17	33	47	31	11	58	25	17	58
9. Language Laboratory	3	78	19	14	56	31	19	3	0	78	3	8	6	83	6	14	81	8	17	75
10. Other? (Please list & check accordingly.)																				

NOTE: All figures shown in table are percentages across all responding sites (N=14). Percentage in NR column shows percentage not responding in this category.

[1] Insufficient responses to provide reliable data.

F. LANGUAGE TRAINING PROGRAM FUNDING, FACILITIES, AND SUPPLIES

1. Does the current Peace Corps budget provide for adequate language training program staffing, materials, and training facilities?

68% Yes 33% No

1a. If "No", please describe what you would like to see improved.

2. Can you usually locate adequate physical facilities for the language training classes?

83% Yes 18% No

2a. If "No", please comment.

3. Does the language training program at this site usually have an adequate supply of the following materials? (Check Yes, No, or Does Not Apply.)

	Yes	No	Does Not Apply
Classroom materials (pencils, tablets, chalk, erasers)	100%	0%	0%
Supplies for reproducing equipment (stencils, chemicals, paper, etc.)	93%	7%	0%
Supplies for audio-visual equipment (blank cassettes, replacement projector bulbs, etc.)	70%	28%	2%
Other materials? (Please describe and indicate if there is an adequate supply.)			

G. ASSIGNMENT OF TRAINEES TO LANGUAGE CLASSES

1. On what basis are incoming students initially assigned to an appropriate language class? (Check all that apply.)

37% Trainees are randomly or arbitrarily assigned to classes.

12% Scores on FSI interviews administered prior to the trainee's arrival on-site.

41% Scores on FSI interviews administered on-site prior to the beginning of the language program.

39% A speaking interview other than the FSI.

7% A role-playing situation.

37% Information about previous language training on Peace Corps application forms.

0% Scores on the Modern Language Aptitude Test (MLAT)

5% Scores on a published language achievement test

5% Scores on a locally-prepared placement test

17% A self-appraisal of language proficiency by the trainee

37% Some other placement procedure (Please describe.)

2. If a test involving any written or printed materials is used to place incoming students, check which of the following it measures. (Check all that apply.)

2% Reading Comprehension

10% Listening Comprehension

10% Speaking

2% Writing

3. How is the trainee's progress in the language class monitored on an ongoing (daily, weekly, etc.) basis? (Check all that apply.)

59% Periodically administered FSI interviews.

(If so, how often are they administered?) ____________

59% A speaking interview other than the FSI.

(If so, how often are they administered?) ____________

41% Role-playing situations.

(How often are they done?) ____________

17% Quizzes or other types of tests accompanying the textbook.

(How often are they given?) ____________

27% Quizzes or other types of tests prepared locally by the instructors as a group.

(How often are they administered?) ____________

22% Quizzes or other types of tests prepared by the individual instructors.

(How often are they administered?) ____________

88% General student performance during the class sessions.

29% Some other progress testing technique. (Please describe.)

____

____

____

4. Once assigned to a class, what flexibility is there for students to move to a more basic or more advanced class depending on their actual performance in the classroom? (Check one.)

(1) 73% It is routinely done.

(2) 25% It happens occasionally.

(3) 3% It rarely, if ever, occurs.

5. On what basis is the trainee's language proficiency determined at the completion of the pre-service program? (Check all that apply.)

85% FSI interviews administered on-site

34% A speaking interview other than the FSI

10% Role-playing situations

2% Published tests accompanying the textbook (i.e., part of the textbook program)

2% A published achievement test not part of the textbook program itself. (Please give title and publisher of test.)

____

____

15% A locally-prepared achievement test developed by the instructors as a group

0% Locally-prepared achievement tests developed individually by the instructors

22% The trainee is asked to fill out a self-appraisal check list or to evaluate his/her own proficiency in some other way.

59% The instructors as a group meet to discuss and evaluate the language proficiency of each trainee.

41% The instructor writes a brief summary of the trainees' language/communication performance.

12% The instructor gives the trainee an overall grade or other rating based on total course performance.

10% Non-language teaching staff (e.g. subject matter teachers) are asked to provide appraisals of the trainees' language/communication ability.

5% Some other proficiency testing technique (Please describe.)

____

____

____

6. Are there any tests or assessments of the trainees' nonverbal communication skills?

31% Yes   69% No

6a. If "Yes", when are these tests or assessments given? (Check all that apply.)

2% At the beginning of language training

27% During language training

12% At the end of the pre-service training

6b. If tests or assessment measures for nonverbal communication are given, please briefly describe.

H. IN-SERVICE LANGUAGE TRAINING

1. Within the past three years, have there been any provisions for in-service training in the target language?

88% Yes   12% No

1a. If "Yes", what have they been? (Check all that apply.)

20% In-service volunteers take part in regular pre-service language courses.

68% In-service volunteers take language classes especially designed for in-service needs.

49% There are no formal language classes for in-service volunteers, but they are encouraged to study the language on their own, obtain tutors, etc.

22% Other (Please describe.) ______________________

1b. When was the last in-service training given? From ________ to ________
Mo. Year Mo. Year

1c. About how many volunteers were in the last in-service training? _____

2. How many hours of formal in-service language instruction would a first year and second year volunteer receive?

A first year volunteer would receive (see text) hours.

A second year volunteer would receive (see text) hours.

3. Is the in-service language instruction mandatory or optional?

22% Mandatory 78% Optional (Base N=37)

3a. If the in-service training is optional, what percentage of volunteers attend? _____ % attend

Range: 0-100% Mean: 54%

4. Are you satisfied with current in-service language training?

42% Yes 58% No

4a. If No, please explain what improvements you would like to make.

____

____

I. TEACHING MATERIALS USED IN THE LANGUAGE TRAINING PROGRAM

The following questions are about the MOST RECENTLY COMPLETED language program at this site.

1. Place a check (✓) by all the materials listed below that were used.

85% Textbook(s)

61% Course syllabus

85% Locally prepared handouts

41% Films or other visual materials

56% Audio tapes or cassettes

63% Local newspapers or magazines

29% Other (Please describe.) ____________________

2. If one or more textbooks were used in the language program, please give the following information for each text.

Title ____________________

Author ____________________

Date of Publication ____________________

Publisher ____________________

2a. Who used the text? (Check one.)

(1) _____ Only the instructor(s)

(2) _____ Both the instructor(s) and trainees

Title ______

Author ______

Date of Publication ______

Publisher ______

2b. Who used the text? (Check one.)

(1) _____ Only the instructor(s)

(2) _____ Both the instructor(s) and trainees

Title ______

Author ______

Date of Publication ______

Publisher ______

2c. Who used the text? (Check one.)

(1) _____ Only the instructor(s)

(2) _____ Both the instructor(s) and trainees

3. If a textbook was not used in the language program, what materials were used? (Please describe.)

______

______

______

______

______

______

4. If a syllabus was used, check one of the following.

(1) 70% It was made especially for this language training course.

(2) 30% It was adapted for use in this language training course.
(N=27)

5. Was there a complete training package or an integrated set of materials (including texts, supplemental materials, quizzes, etc.) used as the basis of instruction for the language training program?

60% Yes 40% No

6. Are you satisfied with the current language training materials?

51% Yes 49% No

6a. If No, what materials do you need? (Please describe.) ______

J. LANGUAGE PROGRAM TRAINING ACTIVITIES

For each of the possible language training activities listed below, place a check (✓) in the appropriate column to indicate the extent to which that activity was used in the most recently completed pre-service language training program.

Base N for "not used" percentage:	TRAINING ACTIVITY	NOT USED (1)	USED IN PROGRAM		
			OF MAJOR IMPORTANCE (2)	OF SOME IMPORTANCE (3)	OF MINOR IMPORTANCE (4)
40	1. Formal classroom language instruction	0%	100%	0%	0%
39	2. Individual language tutoring	5%	38%	49%	14%
40	3. "Homestays" with host country families (weekends or longer)	15%	79%	15%	6%
40	4. Lectures or other formal presentations by host country nationals in target language	35%	19%	50%	31%
39	5. Required language laboratory practice	92%	--[1]	--	--
39	6. Optional language laboratory practice	74%	--	--	--
38	7. Role playing situations	8%	46%	49%	6%
39	8. Courses in other subjects taught in the target language	46%	23%	41%	36%
38	9. Total language immersion (trainees speak only the target language at all times)	42%	64%	14%	23%
38	10. Modified language immersion (trainees speak in the target language for limited specified times)	11%	47%	44%	9%

(Bracketed percentages based on total number marking 2, 3, or 4)

---

[1] Not analyzed due to insufficient "used in program" response rate.

K. LANGUAGE GOALS

1. Does your pre-service training program presently have a written statement of its basic language/communication/cultural goals?

83% Yes 7% No

1a. If "Yes", please include a copy of this goal statement when you return this questionnaire. If "No", please state below what the goals of the language training program appear to be.

2. Is there an evaluation at the end of the language training program as to whether the goals have been achieved?

92% Yes 8% No

2a. If "Yes", please describe how the evaluation is done.

3. What happens if the goals of the language training program are not met? (Please describe.)

4. Is there a specified "target" level on the FSI scale that the trainees should reach by the end of the pre-service training for the primary language and the secondary language?

For the primary language 79% Yes 21% No

For the secondary language 37% Yes 63% No (N=19)

4a. If "Yes", please give the level(s). Primary (see text) Secondary _____

4b. If "Yes", how were the level or levels established? (Please describe.)

5. Is there a specified score on any other kind of test (either published or locally prepared) that the trainees should reach by the end of pre-service training?

For the primary language 25% Yes 75% No

For the secondary language 9% Yes 91% No (N=23)

5a. If "Yes", please identify the test and give the score level established.

The test is (see text).

The score level is _____________.

6. Is there a specific written statement of the basic language/communication/cultural goals for in-service training?

21% Yes 79% No

6a. Is "Yes", please include a copy of this statement when you return this questionnaire. If "No", please state below what the goals of the in-service training appear to be.

L. INSTRUCTIONAL APPROACHES AND ACTIVITIES

Below is a list of possible instructional approaches and activities. Please indicate whether this activity is frequently used, occasionally used, or rarely or never used by placing a check (✓) in the appropriate column.

	Frequently(1)	Occasionally(2)	Rarely or Never used(3)
1. Instructor introduces new vocabulary in context (for example, as part of a dialogue).	93%	5%	3%
2. The instructor uses dramatic techniques and props to make meanings clear or introduce new language material.	72%	26%	3%
3. Trainees often sit in a circle for classroom work.	66%	20%	15%
4. The instructor concentrates on one particular aspect of the language (for example, pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar) during a particular class hour.	39%	41%	20%
5. The target language is used exclusively by the instructor and trainees; English is not permitted.	61%	32%	7%
6. Trainees are given pseudonyms which they use in the language class.	18%	21%	62%
7. The instructor makes use of minimal pairs in teaching pronunciation.	40%	38%	23%
8. Instructor provides pronunciation models for trainees to imitate (individually or in group).	83%	13%	5%
9. Communicative games and/or problem-solving activities are used during the class period.	44%	46%	10%
10. Instructor leads pattern-practice drills in class.	68%	24%	7%
11. Instructor reads printed texts aloud in class (for example, magazine articles, newspaper clippings, etc.).	20%	41%	39%

	Frequently (1)	Occasionally (2)	Rarely or Never used (3)
12. Emphasis is placed on having comfortable, relaxed surroundings during the language class.	64%	24%	8%
13. The instructor uses pre-arranged hand motions or other gestures to elicit and/or correct student responses.	79%	15%	5%
14. Trainees are permitted to ask the instructor to give them the target language equivalents of English phrases or sentences they wish to express in the target language.	29%	44%	27%
15. Soft music is used as a background for classroom work.	2%	7%	90%
16. Trainees recite dialogues from memory.	20%	39%	41%
17. Instructor issues commands for physical actions, which the trainees then carry out.	36%	49%	15%
18. Trainees are given instruction in important nonverbal aspects of communication in the host country setting (for example, proper person-to-person distance during conversation, appropriate eye contact, etc.).	44%	49%	7%
19. Instructor uses pantomime to explain what something means.	54%	38%	8%
20. In the classroom, periods of silence are used during which the trainees reflect on the material being learned.	12%	27%	61%
21. Instructor corrects student by repeating the word or phrase correctly (rather than by explicitly pointing out the error).	66%	32%	2%
22. Any reading or writing that is done is based on what the trainees have practiced orally first.	80%	18%	3%
23. Instructor makes note of trainees' errors so as to adjust lesson planning.	76%	17%	7%
24. The instructor immediately reinforces correct responses.	83%	15%	2%

	Frequently (1)	Occasionally (2)	Rarely or Never used (3)
25. Trainees create skits, dialogues, or other original material in the target language.	59%	29%	12%
26. After being presented a grammar rule, trainees construct sentences using the rule.	61%	22%	17%
27. Reading and writing is given equal attention with listening and speaking.	15%	45%	40%
28. Instructor uses activities designed to get trainees to express their own preferences or values.	46%	38%	15%
29. Instructor explains grammatical points, using target language.	46%	39%	15%
30. Instructor gives dictation (reads target language sentences aloud which are written out in target language by trainees).	8%	40%	53%
31. In a group setting, trainees are encouraged to share and discuss their thoughts and feelings about the learning process.	54%	29%	17%
32. Instructor encourages students to write original notes, paragraphs, letters, etc. in the target language.	34%	46%	20%
33. Trainee errors are used as a basis from which to demonstrate points of grammar.	51%	32%	17%
34. Free (unstructured) conversation is used in class.	66%	29%	5%
35. Instructor plays tape recorded material to class for listening comprehension practice.	10%	46%	44%
36. Students are often divided into small groups to practice the language.	66%	24%	10%
37. Listening and speaking are taught first, followed by reading and writing.	70%	23%	8%
38. Instructor uses photographs or drawings to elicit speech in the target language.	63%	32%	5%

	Frequently (1)	Occasionally (2)	Rarely or Never used (3)
39. The grammatical structures to be taught are selected according to their usefulness in the trainees' particular job assignments.	46%	26%	28%
40. Trainees are discouraged from speaking until they are "ready"; the listening-only period may last several weeks.	0%	0%	100%
41. The instructor controls and directs the class as an "orchestra leader" of drills, student responses, etc.	56%	32%	12%
42. Trainees are allowed to suggest the material they want to learn in the target language.	39%	51%	10%
43. Trainees engage in rapid-fire oral drill.	45%	43%	13%
44. The instructor tries to prevent trainee errors by carefully sequencing and introducing new material.	75%	18%	8%
45. Compared to the students, the instructor speaks very little during the class.	45%	43%	13%
46. Trainees are encouraged to correct one another's errors.	56%	34%	10%
47. In a group setting, trainees are encouraged to share and discuss their thoughts and feelings, using the target language.	59%	29%	12%
48. The instructor is silent while the trainees are engaged in a group task.	49%	44%	7%
49. Rods and charts are used to introduce new language material.	28%	36%	36%
50. Trainees are given vocabulary lists with their translations.	40%	43%	18%
51. Trainees learn one grammatical structure at a time, in a carefully planned sequence.	78%	15%	8%
52. Vocabulary lists are studied in class.	23%	40%	38%

		Frequently (1)	Occasionally (2)	Rarely or Never used (3)
53.	Grammatical structures are introduced within the context of a particular language task (for example, "apologizing," "doubting," "requesting", etc.).	50%	39%	11%
54.	The instructor explains grammatical points, using English.	20%	39%	41%
55.	Trainees are prohibited from using English in class.	56%	24%	20%
56.	The vocabulary presented is directly related to the work the trainees will be doing.	63%	33%	5%
57.	Cultural features reflecting daily life in the host country are incorporated in dialogues or other classroom activities.	93%	7%	0%
58.	Trainees learn songs in the target language.	32%	49%	20%
59.	Trainees are given specific instruction and practice in communicating in the target language by paraphrasing, using gestures, etc. in order to get around deficiencies in vocabulary or grammar.	39%	29%	32%
60.	Trainees take part in role-playing situations to practice previously learned material.	59%	39%	2%
61.	Trainees translate from target language into English or vice versa.	27%	41%	32%
62.	Trainees are expected to learn grammar by observing patterns of structure and becoming aware of these patterns.	51%	37%	12%
63.	Trainees are never given explicit grammar rules; they infer them from the examples provided.	33%	31%	36%

M. USE OF FSI INTERVIEW

The following questions are about the use of the FSI interview in the language training program at this site.

1. As of the end of fiscal year 1980, how many officially trained and currently certified FSI testers were available locally either at the training site or within an hour or so of it? ____________________

2. How are FSI interviews administered and scored at this site? (Check one.) (Base N=34)

   (1) 41% A single tester converses with the trainee and immediately assigns a score. The interview is not tape recorded.

   (2) 15% A single tester converses with the trainee and immediately assigns a score. The interview is tape recorded. What is the subsequent use of the tape recording?

   ____

   ____

   (3) 12% A single tester converses with the trainee but does not assign a score. The interview is tape recorded and the recording is later evaluated to arrive at a score.

   (4) 26% Two testers are present during the interview and discuss and arrive at a score immediately following the interview. The interview is not tape recorded.

   (5) 0% Two testers are present during the interview and discuss and arrive at a score immediately following the interview. The interview is tape recorded. What is the subsequent use of the tape recording? ____________________

   ____

   (6) 3% Two testers are present during the interview but do not assign a score. The interview is tape recorded and the recording is later evaluated to arrive at a score.

   (7) 3% Some other procedure is used for administering and scoring the interview. (Please describe.) ____________________

   ____

   ____

3. In addition to the total (global) FSI score, is any use made of the FSI "language factor" scores (i.e., separate ratings of Listening Comprehension, Pronunciation, Grammar, Vocabulary, and Fluency)?

38% Yes   62% No

3a. If "Yes", please describe the use made of these "factor" ratings.

4. In your opinion, in general, do trainee scores on the FSI accurately reflect the trainee's ability to communicate in the target language effectively and appropriately in his or her job assignment? (N=36)

50% Yes   50% No

4a. If "No", please explain.

5. In the course of the training program (and/or as a result of the volunteer's in-field activities) do perceptible changes in level of communicative ability take place without being reflected in a changed FSI score? 69% Yes   31% No (N=35)

5a. If "Yes", please explain.

6. What is the typical range of FSI scores (including plus values if applicable) shown by the trainees on entry into the pre-service training? (Questions 6-7: see text)

The entry scores for the primary language range from ______ to ______.

The entry scores for the secondary language range from _____ to _____.

6a. What is the average FSI score of these students on entry?

Primary language ____________ Secondary language ____________

6b. What is the typical range of FSI scores shown by these students on completion of the pre-service training?

The end-of-training scores in the primary language range from ______ to ______.

The end-of-training scores in the secondary language range from ______ to ______.

7. What is the average FSI score on completion of training in the primary language and the secondary language?

_____ is the average score in the primary language

_____ is the average score in the secondary language

8. Does the FSI interview as administered at your site routinely include a role-playing situation in which the student serves as an informal interpreter between the two testers? (Check one.) (N=36)

(1) 61% This is rarely or never part of the interview.

(2) 25% This is used on certain occasions or with students at certain levels. (Please explain.)

____

____

____

(3) 14% This is always or almost always part of the interview procedure.

9. In your opinion, what is the minimal level of proficiency at the completion of pre-service training that is required for adequate job performance (on the FSI interview scale) in the primary and secondary language? (see text)

______ for the primary language ______ for the secondary language
(Level) (Level)

10. What kind of feedback is given to the trainees concerning their performance on the FSI interview? (Check one.) (N=36)

(1) 17% Only the FSI global score is given.

(2) 14% Additional feedback on strengths and weaknesses of grammar, pronunciation, vocabulary, etc. is given if requested by the trainee.

(3) 69% Feedback is given routinely as part of all interviews.

11. Does the FSI interview meet your testing needs? (N=35)

46% Yes 54% No

11a. If No, how is it inadequate and what changes would you recommend?

____

____

____

N. ORGANIZATION OF PEACE CORPS LANGUAGE TRAINING PROGRAMS

In this section of the survey, we are interested in your opinions and observations about how the Peace Corps language training program is currently organized.

1. Who assesses the language training needs and sets the language training goals at this site? (Check all that apply.)

27% Peace Corps/Washington

56% Peace Corps Director

76% APCD Staff

90% Language Coordinator

10% Host country agency (for example, Ministry of Agriculture)

44% Other (please specify.) ______

2. Are you satisfied with the present arrangement for defining language needs and goals at this site?

71% Yes 29% No

2a. If "No", please explain.

3. Do you communicate with Peace Corps/Washington about any of the following? (Check "Yes" or "No" for each statement below.)

	YES	NO
Assistance or information about how to develop language training programs.	30%	70% (N=37)
Assistance or information about problems that may occur in the language training program.	30%	70% (N=37)
Request for potentially more appropriate training materials.	51%	40%
Requests for potentially more appropriate testing and assessment techniques.	36%	64%
Recommendations for teacher training practices, teacher training or teacher evaluation techniques.	32%	68% (N=37)
Information concerning language training activities at other Peace Corps sites.	45%	55%
Information concerning training in the same language at different Peace Corps sites.	33%	67% (N=36)
Requests for language coordinator.	32%	68%
Requests for other language consultants.	42%	58% (N=36)

If other information or assistance is requested, please describe briefly.

4. Are you satisfied with Peace Corps/Washington support? (N=31)

68% Yes 32% No

4a. If No, what further support is needed?

O GENERAL OPINIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Is there anything about language training programs that we have not discussed in the questionnaire which you feel is important and should be taken into consideration?

2. Are there any special conditions or circumstances that either facilitate or impede effective language/communication training at this site? (N=34)

50% Yes   50% No

2a. If "Yes", please explain.

3. What additional support services would it be helpful for Peace Corps/Washington to provide for your language training program?

4. What specific aspects of your language training program would you like to improve (e.g. teacher training, teacher selection, language materials, methodology)?

In order to obtain further important background information about your language training program, we would request that you send us one copy of each of the following materials if they are available at your site.

(1) Any written statements of the goals or objectives of your language training program.

(2) A course syllabus or other document describing the content and sequencing of the language program activities.

(3) Copies of any placement or proficiency tests that you have developed locally.

(4) Any other materials that you feel would be relevant.

Please include these materials along with the return mailing of the questionnaire only if it will not delay the return of the questionnaire beyond the THREE WORKING DAY deadline. If you cannot send these materials at this time, then please send them as soon as you can.

Thank you again for your cooperation and assistance.

Protocols for On-Site Visits

Plan of Activities for On-Site Visits

1. First contacts with Director, Language Coordinator.
2. Group meeting of teachers, if possible.
    - anonymity
    - survey data only, no individual teachers identified
    - no identifiable feedback to Director or Coordinator
    - will provide feedback to individual teacher if desired
    - some teachers may be visited more than once, some not at all
3. Classroom observations.
    - 12-15 per country
    - must range among (a) levels, (b) class sequences,(c) different instructors (not specifically selected by coordinator)
    - form should be completed fully. Especially important: class summary and remarks
    - data not shown on form: M-F, HCN, some way to identify observations of same instructor
    - give feedback on observations, if requested
4. Meetings with Director, Coordinator.
    - review list of topics ahead of time (special note of anything not yet covered)
    - opportunity to let director, coordinator give info. not anticipated in questionnaire
    - meeting should be written up as soon as possible (desirably, immediately after meeting)
5. Conversations with teachers/trainees/volunteers
    - write up by no later than end of day
    - separate write-ups not needed, but number of people and their backgrounds should be indicated

- any important anectodal info. should be written up in detail

6. Filling out second questionnaire.
    - by end of visit, a second survey questionnaire should be filled out for that site, as completely as possible.

To bring back:

1. Completed (first) questionnaire for sites not yet responding.
2. Second questionnaire.
3. Observation forms for each class visited.
4. Detailed write-ups of meetings with director, coordinator.
5. Summaries of information obtained from teachers, trainees, volunteers.
6. An overview write-up of training program at that site.
7. Syllabuses and language learning goal statements (if not sent with questionnaire).
8. FSI data (if available).

PC Director Interview

Explain reasons for project and describe activities to date

Anonymity of data gathering

To be covered:

- goals of language training program as envisioned by director
- structure of program
- perceived degree of success of program - major strengths and weaknesses
- "sensitive spots" in current program
- messages to Washington
- other topics

Coordinator Interview

First contact:

Explain reason for project:

why this site selected

anonymity of data gathering

Arrange schedule for visit:

classroom observations

3-4 classes per day

visits to cultural training/health services classes, etc.

not concentrating on the instructor, but on classroom activities

(arrange short group meeting with instructors if possible)

conversations with teachers

conversations with trainees/volunteers

Second contact:

What training has led up to this point - what will follow (i.e., situate current classes in total program)

Any appreciable differences in language training programs over past two years (length, languages taught, location, composition of trainee group, etc.)

Language Learning Goals

Written statement?(obtain)

Any explicit culture/communication goals?

Who defines goals?

Is there an evaluation of whether goals are being met?

What sort of feedback if goals are not met?

Physical setup, budget and support

Adequacy of physical facilities for language training

Adequacy of materials and supplies

Adequacy of language training budget

Nature, adequacy, and satisfaction with PC/W support - ways in which support has been called for in past

Instructor selection and training

Procedures for selecting instructors

Availability, seasonal variations

General background and experience of language instructors

Instructor training; prior to program, during program

General level of quality of instructors

Procedures for evaluating instructor performance

Cultural aspects relating to instructor effectiveness

Methodology and course structure

General description of methodology

General description of course materials

Special courses or other accommodations for older learners, non-academic learners

Modifications in course content or procedures to suit eventual trainee job assgts.

Integration of language training with (1) culture and customs training, (2) technical training, (3) health and sanitation, (4) other

General description of inservice language training: nature of training, mandatory or optional, number of contact hours

Informal language learning contacts (estimate degree of outside contacts and learning effectiveness)

Evaluation

Assignment of trainees to classes (procedures used)

Procedures for monitoring trainee progress; feedback to trainees

Procedures for assessing language proficiency on completion of preservice program

Procedures for testing nonverbal communication, cultural sensitivity, culturally appropriate behavior

Evaluation (FSI Interview)

Configuration, including situation/role playing

When administered

Use of factor scores/feedback

Average scores on entry into training, primary and secondary languages

Average scores on completion of preservice training

FSI score increases during service

Pressure for inflated FSI scores?

What happens if trainees do not reach minimum FSI levels?

Does FSI interview meet testing needs?

Suggestions for more appropriate testing procedures

Evaluation (General)

Greatest areas of success of language program

Greatest areas of need in language program

Satisfaction with language training for older training for older trainees

Satisfaction with language training for non-academic learners

Any other observations or suggestions

Conversations with Trainees

Was your placement in language program appropriate?

What expectations do you have for language study?

General perceptions of the teachers.

General perceptions of the FSI interview (if administered at start of training).

Conversations with Inservice Volunteers

All of above, plus:

Perceived differences from school study of languages.

General opinions on preservice language training program - most effective, least effective aspects of program.

Relevance of preservice language training to job being done.

Any formal inservice training? Usefulness and relevance of this training.

Any explicit self-learning activities in field? Perceived effectiveness.

Suggestions for improvement of preservice and inservice programs.

(Note: For trainees who have been in the program for several weeks, some of the "Volunteer" questions may be appropriate.)

Questions for Teachers

(Relating to the observed class):

Was the class observed typical, or unusual in some way?

How does this class relate to previous and later classes?

Any other comments on that class period.

(Relating to the language program in general):

What do you see as the goals of the PC language program?

What particular problems do you encounter in working with PC trainees/volunteers? (cultural differences, differing expectations regarding instructional process, teacher role, etc.)

Adequacy of materials and facilities for language teaching.

How did you get the job? Prior teaching/language teaching experience in and out of Peace Corps.

What particular training did you receive concerning the Peace Corps teaching job?

What additional training (if any) is needed? What ongoing support during the program is needed?

How is your teaching performance evaluated?

What is your opinion of the FSI interview? How well does it relate to what you are trying to teach?

How pleasant/rewarding do you find the PC teaching job? Would you teach in another program?

What does the volunteer need to be taught in order to do an effective job in the field (from both language and cultural standpoints)?

Are volunteers adequately prepared in language/culture by the end of preservice?

Any suggestions for effective inservice training or procedures for volunteer self-study in the field?

OBSERVATION RECORD FORM

1. Country: self-explanatory.

2. Region: Please fill in LAAM, NANEAP, or AFRICA.

3. Language: The target language for the class being observed.

4. Name of Program: The designation of the particular program now in operation.

5. Class Type: Regular, older learners, non-academic learners, or other (specify).

6. Class Level: Beginning (trainees have no prior exposure to the language) or intermediate (students in the class have had study of the language prior to the PC).

7. Loc. in Seq.: Briefly characterize (1) how far into the program was the particular class observed, and (2) how this class fits into what has recently been taught and will be taught.

8. Room Arrangement: Arrangement of chairs, tables; instructor's position.

9. Posters/Realia: Briefly describe any language-related materials on wall or in room (e.g., verb charts, vocabulary lists, language-related pictures, etc.).

10. Blackboard, other equip.: Indicate whether room has a blackboard. If other presentation equipment is in room (flip chart, overhead projector, etc.), please note, even if not used in that particular class.

11. Noise, Other Distractions: Note any outside noises, other conditions that make effective classroom work difficult.

12. Date of Obs.: Month and day (06/05) of observation.

13. Begin Obs.: Time at which observed class starts (10:00 am).

13. End Obs.: Time at which class ends (11:30 am).

14. No. of Students: Head count of students actually in class.

15. Remarks: Please show here any remarks concerning the physical setup of the classroom or other aspects covered in the preceding items (essentially, this provides room to expand on anything preceding).

16. Major Class Activity: A short summary description of the main activity and purpose of that class session.

17. Class Control: This concerns the percentage of time during the total class period when the focus of control for the class was with the teacher, the students, or shared between teacher and students. The focus of control is with the teacher when he/she is "in charge" of the activities and is determining "where the class is going" in its activities (for example, drill practice led by the teacher, or work with dialogs would be under teacher control, even though the students were responding and interacting). Student control means the students themselves, individually or collectively, are deciding what to do, with the teacher only as a resource person or facilitator. "Shared" is group discussion or activity that seems balanced as to responsibility for control. (The class control % figures should total 100).

    Note on percentages: Please use two-figure percentages, placed in the square brackets as appropriate. For "100%," please use 99 (this saves us a tabulation column). For percentages less than 10, use preceding zeroes (04, 07, etc.).

18. Teacher Language: Percentage of time during the entire class the teacher speaks in the target language, in English.

19. Student Language: (as for Teacher Language).

20. Activities: "Structured" activities are those in which the "next step" in the activity is highly predictable (pattern practice, study of dialogues, question/answer, etc.). "Free conversation" is conversation on topics that do not deal directly with the lesson plan but are brought up by the students (or by the teacher on an obviously spontaneous basis). "Semi-structured" activities show some general planning overall but allow for some expansion and digression in the course of the activity. (Percentages in Activities boxes should add to 100).

21. Focus: Estimate the total percentage of class time that was spent in each of four instructional modes: linguistic, "functional" (learning to carry out specified language use functions such as requesting, complaining, sympathizing, agreeing, etc.), "topical" (banking, shopping, tourism, etc.), or "situational" (at the bank, at the supermarket, etc.).

22. Pacing: A few words concerning the general pacing of the class--too slow or belabored; at about the right pace for comprehension; too fast, not enough explanation or opportunity for practice.

23. Sequencing: Did class progress in an orderly and logical manner or were there skips and digressions?

24. Assignment: Indicate any homework assignment or any other recommended activity in preparation for next meeting of class.

25. CC: Describe here any instances in which cross-cultural differences between teacher and students raised a barrier to communication or otherwise negatively affected the learning process or general classroom interaction.

26. Student Involvement: Estimate the total percentage of the class period during which the students appeared to be consciously engaged in the learning process, as opposed to being bored, wool-gathering, etc.

27. Class Summary and Remarks: This should be a brief account of the main goals of the class, the major activities involved, and a qualitative description of the overall success of the class. This space should also be used to give any important details and comments that are not included in other parts of the observation form.

28. Activities Log (2 inside pages): The "time" column should show the minutes into the class at which the activity begins. For consistency, teacher and student activities should be in the present tense (e.g., "Reads dialogue aloud"/"Listen quietly") T and S can be used as abbreviations. "Materials/ Equip." should be noted whenever textbook is used, materials projected, recordings listened to, etc.

29. Activities Checklist (last page): Immediately after each class, each of the listed activities should be checked as having been "observed" (left-hand column) or "not observed" (right-hand column) during that class.

Appendix C

Classroom Observation Form

( )( )Country____________ ( )Region__________ ( )( )Language____________ Name of Program______________________________

( )Class Type____________ ( )Class Level__________ Loc. in Seq.______________________________

Room Arrangement______________________ Posters/Realia________________ Blackboard, Other Equip.________________

Noise, Other Distractions____________________ Date of Obs.___/___ Begin Obs.________ End Obs.________ No. of Students_____ ( )( )

Remarks____

____

Major Class Activity____

Class Control: [ ][ ]Teacher [ ][ ]Student [ ][ ]Shared Teacher Lang. [ ][ ]Target [ ][ ]Eng. Student Lang. [ ][ ]Target [ ][ ]Eng.

Activities: [ ][ ]Structured [ ][ ]Semi-Structured [ ][ ]Free Conv. Focus: [ ][ ]Linguistic [ ][ ]Functional [ ][ ]Topical [ ][ ]Situational

Pacing______________________________ Sequencing______________________________

CC____ [ ][ ]Student Involvemen

Assignment____

Class Summary and Remarks____

____

____

____

____

____

____

____

____

____

TIME	TEACHER	STUDENT	MATERIALS/EQUIP.	REMARKS

1. Instructor introduces new vocabulary in content (for example, as part of a dialogue).

2. The instructor uses dramatic techniques and props to make meanings clear or introduce new language material.

3. Trainees often sit in a circle for classroom work.

4. The instructor concentrates on one particular aspect of the language (for example, pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar) during a particular class hour.

5. The target language is used exclusively by the instructor and trainees; English is not permitted.

6. Trainees are given pseudonyms which they use in the language class.

7. The instructor makes use of minimal pairs in teaching pronunciation.

8. Instructor provides pronunciation models for trainees to imitate (individually or in group).

9. Communicative games and/or problem-solving activities are used during the class period.

10. Instructor leads pattern-practice drills in class.

11. Instructor reads printed texts aloud in class (for example, magazine articles, newspaper clippings, etc.).

12. Emphasis is placed on having comfortable, relaxed surroundings during the language class.

13. The instructor uses pre-arranged hand motions or other gestures to elicit and/or correct student responses.

14. Trainees are permitted to ask the instructor to give them the target language equivalents of English phrases or sentences they wish to express in the target language.

15. Soft music is used as a background for classroom work.

16. Trainees recite dialogues from memory.

17. Instructor issues commands for physical actions, which the trainees then carry out.

18. Trainees are given instruction in important nonverbal aspects of communication in the host country setting (for example, proper person-to-person distance during conversation, appropriate eye contact, etc.).

19. Instructor uses pantomime to explain what something means.

20. In the classroom, periods of silence are used during which the trainees reflect on the material being learned.

21. Instructor corrects student by repeating the word or phrase correctly (rather than by explicitly pointing out the error).

22. Any reading or writing that is done is based on what the trainees have practiced orally first.

23. Instructor makes note of trainees' errors so as to adjust lesson planning.

24. The instructor immediately reinforces correct responses.

25. Trainees create skits, dialogues, or other original material in the target language.

26. After being presented a grammar rule, trainees construct sentences using the rule.

29. Instructor explains grammatical points, using target language.

30. Instructor gives dictation (reads target language sentences aloud which are written out in target language by trainees).

31. In a group setting, trainees are encouraged to share and discuss their thoughts and feelings about the learning process.

32. Instructor encourages students to write original notes, paragraphs, letters, etc. in the target language.

34. Free (unstructured) conversation is used in class.

35. Instructor plays tape recorded material to class for listening comprehension practice.

36. Students are often divided into small groups to practice the language.

38. Instructor uses photographs or drawings to elicit speech in the target language.

39. The grammatical structures to be taught are selected according to their usefulness in the trainees' particular job assignments.

40. Trainees are discouraged from speaking until they are "ready"; the listening-only period may last several weeks.

41. The instructor controls and directs the class as an "orchestra leader" of drills, student responses, etc.

42. Trainees are allowed to suggest the material they want to learn in the target language.

43. Trainees engage in rapid-fire oral drill.

45. Compared to the students, the instructor speaks very little during the class.

46. Trainees are encouraged to correct one another's errors.

47. In a group setting, trainees are encouraged to share and discuss their thoughts and feelings, using the target language.

48. The instructor is silent while the trainees are engaged in a group task.

49. Rods and charts are used to introduce new language material.

50. Trainees are given vocabulary lists with their translations.

51. Trainees learn one grammatical structure at a time, in a carefully planned sequence.

52. Vocabulary lists are studied in class.

53. Grammatical structures are introduced within the content of a particular language task (for example, "apologizing," "doubting," "requesting", etc.).

54. The instructor explains grammatical points, using English.

56. The vocabulary presented is directly related to the work the trainees will be doing.

57. Cultural features reflecting daily life in the host country are incorporated in dialogues or other classroom activities.

58. Trainees learn songs in the target language.

59. Trainees are given specific instruction and practice in communicating in the target language by paraphrasing, using gestures, etc. in order to get around deficiencies in vocabulary or grammar.

60. Trainees take part in role-playing situations to practice previously learned material.

61. Trainees translate from target language into English or vice versa.

63. Trainees are never given explicit grammar rules; they infer them from the examples provided.